

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. IV.

AUGUST, 1903.

NO. 3.

## Features of the Electoral Battle

**T**HE battle of the ballots is past. The 25th of June brought what the 16th promised. The fear of the gigantic growth of the social democracy has united all the bourgeois parties, with a few honorable exceptions, into a solid phalanx against us in order to save what was left to be saved.

In 1898 we won 24 out of 96 seats at the second election; in 1903 we won only 25 out of 119.\*

This is an advance backwards which the coalition of the bourgeois parties made against us.

Illusionists hoped that the capitalist parties of the left would sacrifice everything in the second election in order to secure as strong a left wing as possible in the reichstag, even if this could only be secured through a strengthening of the social democracy which had so painfully curtailed liberalism in the first election. But they forget that we were dealing with a bourgeoisie which had been lashed into terror, and which would rather throw itself head over heels into the arms of the reactionaries and surrender everything for which it had previously stood.

This is not the first time that German liberalism has abandoned its principles. Its history is the history of its defeats which it has always owed to its indecision, lack of leadership and cowardice, which have sentenced it to play that sorrowful role by which it is distinguished from the liberalism of the other states of western Europe. But even if this is not the first time that it has surrendered, it has never done so before in such a bare-faced, absolutely shameless manner as at this time.

If there were still those in our own ranks who had built their hopes upon this liberalism and looked upon it as still capable of life and creative action, the 25th of June should have thor-

---

\*Later advices increase this to 26.

oughly cured them, even if the 16th of June and its results had not already completed the cure.

In the beginning it appeared as if the campaign would pass without great interest being aroused. But in just the degree that the Social Democracy threw itself with all its energy into the battle and pushed aggressively forward did the picture change.

Week by week the electoral battle became warmer until finally the bourgeois parties took up a platform after they had so long, like helpless children, beseeched the government in vain.

This programme was not formulated by the imperial government, it developed spontaneously out of the battle and suited all who were bourgeois inclined from Eugen Richter to Von Norrmann and Kardorff. This programme was simply "Fight the Social Democracy!" This phrase was presently on all tongues and pens and a campaign of slander began such as we have scarcely ever experienced.

In all the campaigns that have taken place during six and thirty years for the North German and German Reichstag, the problems of the incoming Reichstag have never played so subordinate a role as in the campaign just past. The only point which was generally discussed in the opposing speeches and leaflets was the formation of commercial treaties. As to the new military and naval policy, new colonial and taxation measures, foreign and internal policy, the great majority of the bourgeois candidates had nothing to say. These candidates were chosen without the great majority of the voters knowing what position they took in regard to these questions, so there cannot fail to be great disappointments. On the other hand, from the very first day in which the bourgeois parties went into the campaign the battle against the Social Democracy was as violent as if the founding of the future State was immediately at hand, and as if they were called upon, cost what it might, to save themselves from it.

This phase of the struggle corresponds thoroughly to the situation in which the bourgeois parties found themselves. They are without ideals and weary of opposition. They no longer have any program, and never can have. But one must have a goal if he is to draw the masses to him and not be left defenseless. So it was that they clung to that upon which they had always depended for success with the unintelligent masses who follow, sheeplike, and above all with the great mass of Philistines. The cry was also raised to rally against a violent "uprising," and to make sure of the effectiveness of this alarm the memorandum books of such holy priests as Schuster, Eugen Richter, Lorenz and Burger were searched and lies and slanders drawn therefrom until, as the saying goes, the "rafters bent and the good tailors' and shoemakers' hair began to stand on end."



They declared the Social Democracy to be fatherlandless and treasonable, that it destroyed marriage and the family, would overthrow the throne and rob the people of their holy religion—something that sounded especially good when it appeared in the National Liberal leaflets—it would destroy property, overthrow the middle class and the handworkers, in short, that it would not leave one stone upon another of the present state or order of society. So against this whoever can must help. And many helped who had nothing to lose but their poverty and their debts.

But even this was not enough. Actual or alleged quotations which had been torn from their connection were sent out against one party member after another; the party was denounced as the enemy of labor because it was alleged that its representatives voted against all social reform laws, and was branded as an overthrower because its representatives refused to indorse the budget. In short, everything that could be done was done to picture the Social Democracy as a moral and political monster. After listening to all this the question might well have arisen if such a party could even receive a thousand votes and elect one of its representatives? But the result? The opposite from that which our opponents hoped occurred; 56 representatives and over three million votes at the first throw! A more overwhelming victory for Social Democracy and annihilating defeat of its opponents was not possible.

The same game was repeated even with greater violence at the second election. That we obtained only 25 seats out of 119 at the second election, however, was not the result of this manner of fighting, but the result of the despairing coalition of all our opponents.

*Frankfurter Zeitung*, *Freisinnige Zeitung* and *tutti quanti* lamented: The Social Democracy owed their victory only to the circumstance that they stuck their own programme in their pocket and sought to catch votes with the liberal democratic programme. I do not know if any such thing was done in the campaign. I have not noticed anything of the kind; but even if it was done, our opponents saw to it that the Social Democratic candidate appeared in the most horrible and frightful form possible, and still such a result? Wherefore did not the bourgeois parties with whose programme the Social Democratic party, it is claimed, went fishing, secure at least one representative in the main election? It will be rather difficult for the knights of Liberalism to answer this.

This is simply a repetition of the old allegation that we hear so loud after every election and always with the accompanying result that the parties with whose programme it is alleged we fought become ever weaker and we ever stronger. Our oppo-

nents fail to grasp the true causes of their downfall. These are the increasing proletarianization of the masses and the ever sharper class antagonisms arising therefrom. There is the growing discontent in ever-widening circles with the dominating economic and political condition, the military and naval policy, and a comparison of all the beautiful phrases with the sorrowful reality. And it is the Social Democracy which makes itself the mouth-piece of all these aspirations of the discontented and which binds all these elements firmer and firmer to itself.

But then it is only the "transients" which, according to our opponents, make Social Democracy so large. But it is not simply that the number of these "transients" is ever larger; they remain permanently with the party, and from the "transients" of to-day come the good party members of to-morrow.

Notwithstanding all this we have to reckon with our losses. But losses have never been lacking with us at any election, sometimes large and sometimes small. That we should hold all of the 58 districts which we possessed during the last legislative period no thinking person could expect. Among these 58 districts there were a number which we had conquered for the first time only by the narrowest majorities. They were more or less accidental victories. I am only surprised that such losses were not more numerous. That Offenbach and Hanau, which from their economic structure should be considered as securely in the possession of the party, were among such districts is to be regretted. But we may console ourselves with the reflection that the enemy have conquered for the last time, and when we compare the defeats of our opponents and our own many victories we can endure our losses without sorrow. We cannot continuously maintain a district exposed to the assault of the enemies, if the natural conditions for Social Democracy are lacking there, *i. e.*, the necessary industrial development and the class antagonism proceeding therefrom. Where these are lacking any victory must always be looked upon as one of ephemeral value. And districts which we secure only through the momentary allegiance of certain classes we can also lose again.

Our permanent victory rests upon the fact that capitalist development creates the essential conditions therefor. This is proven by the large and growing number of electoral districts which we conquered at once in the main election or in which we lacked so very few votes for victory, that we can surely conquer them the next time without the help of outsiders.

If the numerous victories and the great number of votes which came to the Social Democrats was the main characteristic of the last election, the development which the different bourgeois parties went through deserves some consideration.



The annihilating overthrow which the leader of the agrarian league received at the first election and which the secondary election completed is especially gratifying. Hahn, Roesicke, Oertel, Schrempf, Lucke are no more. Their role is played out. These defeats show that the struggle with the agrarian forces was not without result, and that the effect of the agrarian agitation was destroyed when we exposed its weakness on the decisive field of battle.

No less gratifying than the overthrow of the leader of the agrarian league was the overthrow of the National liberal leader, Bassermann, who acted as assistant to the tariff makers of the last session and who did midwife service for the infamous measures of Groeber and Von Kardorff in the last session of the Reichstag. Nemesis has done her work quickly with Herr Bassermann. Along with him fell Vice President Büsing, whose followers in the second election helped the representative of the Mecklenburg Junkers into the saddle in opposition to our party comrade, Grothe. Herr Hasse, the head of the Pan-Germans, whose electoral district in Leipsic had belonged to him for six and thirty years, was now given over to our Comrade Mottler, "the red postmaster." In addition we find that in this, as in previous Reichstags, the great majority of the National electorals who were chosen in the second election are once more the slaves of the agrarians.

The tower of the Centre also shows breaks. It is standing upon shattered foundations. The election in the industrial districts of the Rhineland and Westphalia, the losses to us in Mainz and Reichenbach-Neurode are for the Centre a *mene tekel*. Its two-faced and wavering policy is recognized by its followers among the laborers and they are leaving its ranks in swarms to enter the Social Democracy. The fighting methods of the Centre against the Social Democracy were especially violent and disreputable in this campaign. It feels the enemy at its throat. But even the wildest lies and slanders cannot continuously find believers, even among the voters of the Centre. We have placed our feet firmly upon the territory of the Centre and push further on. The Social Democracy is accomplishing what no other party was able to do. It will finally be the victor in the battle with the Centre.

Anti-Semitism also, this most senseless of all party organizations, has seen its possessions melt away fully one-fourth. If it disappeared completely from the picture no one would shed any tears.

The National Social party presents a peculiar picture, since this party was called into life particularly to draw the laborers away from Social Democracy and to attract them to the "social

Imperialism" and inspire them with enthusiasm for army, fleet and imperial politics. Herr Naumann, the founder of this party, has never comprehended that a "social Imperialism" is a contradiction in itself and that armies, fleets and imperial politics can only be maintained at the cost of the laborer. Therefore he with his party have gone down. To be sure, they have succeeded with great effort in electing Herr von Gerlach in the second election. But the head of the party, Herr Naumann, in spite of the unspeakable efforts which he and his friends made, is now outside the Reichstag, and he is himself singing the swan song of the party which he founded.

Herr Naumann complains that the "stronger brother" of the National Socialism, the Social Democracy, has strangled his party. What the outlook is for this weak "brother" of the Social Democracy is shown for the second time in the Jena electoral district. Five years ago the National Social party helped Herr Bassermann to victory, and this time they did the same for his successor. Herr Bassermann would have been cleverer had he this time also stood as a candidate in Jena instead of in Karlsruhe, where he would have been certain of victory with National Social help.

That things would happen in the Jena electoral district once more as they have happened was evident. When Herr Damaschke, the candidate of the National Socials in Jena, was asked before the main election if he would eventually support the Social Democratic candidate, he replied that the Social Democracy was the last party for which in the second election he would vote. This same Damaschke told the farmers in the Jena electoral district, "If you wish to have your last cow taken out of the stable, then vote for Social Democracy."

This is the way "National Socialism" showed up in the light of the reichstag election.

It is not the least gain that we have received from the last Reichstag election that we got rid of a whole mass of illusions. Here Social Democracy, there bourgeoisie! will hereafter be the battle cry.

The new Reichstag shows, so far as the bourgeois parties are concerned, not simply a quantitative but much more a qualitative loss. Barth, Schrader, Broemel, Bassermann, Büsing, Oertel will not be easily replaced by new strength. This is but an illustration on this point of the downfall of the bourgeois world. Yes, the evening of their day draws nigh.

There, downfall; with us, the upward growth! The result of the election is the most striking vote of confidence that the present tactics and method of fighting of the Social Democracy could have received. The voters have expressed their opinion

of the tactics and manner of fighting adopted by our opponents. All the accusations, all the calumnies that the whole bourgeoisie has so vehemently heaped upon us in a manner never before attempted have been splintered upon the Social Democracy like glass on granite.

This should be to us a lesson and a guide in the coming battle.

As Social Democracy has until now grown in all situations and conquered all opponents, so it will and should do in the future.

In the name of the class-conscious proletariat and all those idealists who with us strive for the progress of humanity in every sphere, "*Forward!!*"—*August Bebel in Neue Zeit. Translated by A. M. Simons.*



## A Foretaste of the Orient

**H**E who may not agree with the conclusions arrived at in the telling of this bit of California's history, should at least value the facts narrated—for they are surely pregnant with meaning to those who study the history of the labor world.

The town of Oxnard is in Ventura county, about sixty miles north of Los Angeles, and was founded by the American Beet Sugar Company, in which Henry T. Oxnard is the central figure. On the evening of March 24, of the present year, the Associated Press dispatches announced that there was "riot" in Oxnard—that the Japanese and Mexican unions were terrorizing the town, shooting and killing peaceable non-union men, whose only desire was to exercise the right of American citizens and work for any wage they chose. Being within a few hours' ride of the place, the next morning's train carried me to the gates of the sugar factory. My only companions on the car were a parcel of drummers, who were quite naturally anxious to know just how peaceful a state the town might now be in. To this end anyone who might know, and especially the conductor, was cross-questioned in a most thorough manner:

"How many men were killed—could the sheriff control the situation—was it safe for a traveling man to go about his business on the streets?" were some of the queries that received apparently confusing replies.

"Yes, there was a man killed and four others wounded—all union men—and the town is now quiet."

"How's that," said a salesman for a wholesale hardware firm, "union men start a riot and only union men shot? Something queer about that! I know a house that shipped revolvers here last week—who bought 'em, that's what I'd like to know. Couldn't have been the unions if all the dead men are on the other side,"—which was without doubt a common sense conclusion from a purely business point of view.

Certainly the town seemed quiet, as I walked up from the station, the only noticeable thing being a little squad of Japanese union pickets that met the train and were easily recognized by their white buttons labeled "J. M. L. A." (Japanese-Mexican Labor Association) over the insignia of a rising sun and clasped hands. Oxnard was full of those white buttons—and when the first thousand of them had been distributed, and no more obtainable, hundreds of beet thinners put red buttons in their button-holes to show that they were union men.



On the presentation of my blue card, I was warmly welcomed at headquarters by J. M. Lizarraras and Y. Yamagachi, secretaries of the Mexican and Japanese unions. They had a plain tale to tell, and one which I found was fully borne out by facts known to all the towns folk—for even the petty merchants, strange to say, freely acknowledged that the men had been bullied, swindled and shot down, without reason or provocation.

The Beet Sugar Company had fostered the organization of a scab contracting company—known as the Western Agricultural Contracting Company—whose double purpose was to reduce the price of thinning beets from five to as low as four and a quarter dollars an acre, and at the same time undermine and destroy the unions. Not content with the lowering of wages, they also forced the men to accept store orders instead of cash payments, with its usual accompaniment of extortionate prices for the merchandise sold. These tricks, of course, are as old as the hills, and consequently when the men rebelled there was a great surprise among the labor skimmers, who had no idea that Japanese and Mexicans would ever have wit enough to unite for mutual protection, or that if they did temporarily unite, their organization could possibly last for any length of time, with the obstacles of different tongues, temperaments and social environments to bring speedy wreck to such a union. But the men did organize, did hang together—in spite of the rain of bullets which were poured down upon them—and finally whipped Oxnard's beet sugar company, with its backing of millions.

To Socialists it is needless to point out that to whip a capitalist to-day means nothing more than that you must fight him again to-morrow, but the significance of this particular skirmish, in the great class war, lies in the fact that workers from the Occident and Orient, strangers in tongues, manners and customs, gathered together in a little western village, should so clearly see their class interest rise above all racial feelings of distrust.

Almost as soon as the union was formed, Major Driffel, manager of the Oxnard sugar factory, asked that a committee confer with him. It was done, and the following significant sample of conversation which took place was opened by the major with this question:

"I want to know the object of your organization?"

"The object," said Secreary Lizarraras, "is to keep the old prices. The Western Agricultural Contracting Company cut prices to control the business and we could not compete."

"You have a perfect right to do so," replied the Major, "but I have heard that you have a scale of prices which is detrimental to the interests of the farmers, and the interests of the farmers are our interests, because if you raise the price of labor to the farmers and they see they cannot raise beets at a profit, *we will*

*have to take steps to drive you out of the country and secure help from the outside—even if we have to spend \$100,000 in doing it."*

With this ultimatum the union's committee retired, and the war commenced in earnest. Secretary Yamagachi was arrested for holding an orderly street meeting and forced to furnish five hundred dollars bail—which he did, and was promptly acquitted by the jury that tried him. Two more Japanese were arrested for "disturbing the peace"—their offense being a successful persuasion of some thirty of their fellow countrymen to leave the company's ranch and join the union. Failing in their attempts to break up the union by "legal" means, the union-smashers tried more forceful methods. Armed guards—drummed up from among the rifraf of the saloons—were stationed over the few non-union men that were still at work in the fields, and those who desired to quit the ranches, where they were "protected," were not allowed to take their blankets, and, moreover, their pay was held up. Farmers sent orders into town for rounds of buckshot-cartridges, hoping with threats and intimidation to drive the men to their bidding. From the scab contracting company's headquarters came rumors of the purchase of arms and ammunition in large quantities—and these were not false rumors, as the events that followed amply proved.

On Monday afternoon, of March 24, the employers played their last card and the crisis came. A farmer by the name of Arnold—notorious as a union hater—was deputized a constable, and, arming himself with two revolvers and considerable whisky, set about escorting a small number of scabs from the company's boarding house to a nearby farm. A crowd of union men collected around the outgoing wagon, and, without show of force or violence, tried to persuade the scabs to join the union. The last scab to leave the boarding house for the wagon came out armed with a shotgun and revolver and the trouble commenced. The crowd tried to disarm him as he made his way through the press, and while a tussle for the possession of the shotgun was in progress, Deputy Constable Arnold stepped up behind a union man and shot him in the neck. This was the signal for a rain of bullets that poured down upon the crowd of unarmed union men from the doors and windows of the scab boarding house. Death followed the volley—one man being killed and four wounded.

All honor to the martyrdom of Louis Vasquez!—the first man to lay down his life for his mates in the town of Oxnard.

The unarmed union men were horrified but not frightened. They pursued and captured the fleeing Arnold, and, after disarming him, handed him over to the police. Sheriff McMartin himself told me that if it were not for the protection afforded by



the union leaders, Arnold would have been hung on the spot. In twenty minutes the whole affair was over. No arrests were made, because none but "strike breakers" were guilty of assault, and the next day the daily press all over the country broke out with scare heads telling of the "Riot in Oxnard."

Proof of the complicity of the town and county officials was quick to follow. The place of holding the inquest was twice changed from one town to another—making the summoning of witnesses a most difficult feat—and the dead man's body hurriedly given to the unions on two hours' notice in such a decayed condition that immediate burial was necessary, thereby attempting to prevent the public demonstration of a big funeral. But in spite of this most vile scheme, nearly a thousand men escorted the body to its grave. Japanese and Mexicans, side by side, dumb through lack of a common speech, yet eloquent in expressions of fraternity, marched with uncovered heads through the streets of Oxnard. On the hearse was a strange symbol to Western eyes, a huge lotus flower—an offering from the Japanese union.

From the highest to the lowest, the officials of the county acted as one man in their attempts to suppress public investigation, the final proof of which culminated in the act of the district attorney, Selby, who refused to hold a preliminary examination of Deputy Constable Arnold, although nearly a dozen witnesses testified, at the inquest, that Arnold shot an unresisting union man in the neck and precipitated the killing.

The worth of the Japanese and Mexicans as labor organizers was now put to proof. At the Japanese headquarters there was system like that of a railroad office or an army in the field. They had a well-trained corps of officers—secretaries, interpreters, captains of squads, messengers, and most complete system of information. A map of the valley hung on the wall, with the location of the different camps of beet thinners plainly marked. Yards upon yards of brown paper placards were constantly being tacked up, giving in picturesque Japanese lettering the latest bulletins, directions or orders. Meetings of the executive committees from the two unions were constantly being held for agreement as to mutual action. I was intensely interested at the manner in which they got over the difficulties of language at the conferences. The joint committees would gather around a long table—at opposite ends sat the respective presidents, secretaries and interpreters—and first the question to be discussed would be started in English, then each nationality in turn would listen to an explanation of the affair in its own language and come to the conclusion; then the results would be again stated in English and the final agreement recorded by the secretaries. Respect for order was a marked feature of these meetings, each nationality keeping politely silent while the other had the matter before it

for discussion and decision. The innate courtesy, which is always found in Spanish blood, was fully equaled by the decorum of the Japanese.

Seeing that there was no law for their personal protection in Oxnard, the unions organized a patrol to cover the town. Squads of little Japanese and Mexicans relieved each other all through the night and day, for no man knew what the next murderous action of the strike breakers might be. On every hand troubles began to multiply. Many men were without a cent of money, and the unions opened a restaurant where those who were broke could get their meals. Funeral expenses, care of the wounded, and assistance to men who had families, were met by collecting the few dollars left in the pockets of the union men. To all of which the Japanese, being the richest, were the largest contributors.

A few days after the shooting, the unions published the following:

"STATEMENT TO THE PUBLIC.

"Owing to the many false statements printed in the *Los Angeles Times* and other daily papers about our organization and the murderous assault made upon the union men last Monday afternoon, we ask that the following statement of facts be published in justice to the thirteen hundred men whom the Japanese-Mexican Labor Association represents:

"In the first place, we assert, and are ready to prove, that on Monday afternoon, and at all times during the shooting, the union men were unarmed, while the non-union men, sent out by the Western Agricultural Contract Company, were prepared for a bloody fight with arms purchased, in many cases, recently from hardware stores in this town. As a proof of the fact that the union men were not guilty of the murderous violence, we point to the fact that the authorities have not arrested a single union man—the only man actually put under bonds, or arrested, being Deputy Constable Charles Arnold.

"Our union has always been law abiding, and has in its ranks at least nine-tenths of all the beet thinners in this section—who have not asked for a raise in wages, but only that the wages be not lowered, as was demanded by the beet growers. Many of us have families, were born in this country, and are lawfully seeking to protect the only property that we have—our labor. It is just as necessary for the welfare of the valley that we get a decent living wage, as it is that the machines in the great sugar factory be properly oiled—if the machines stop, the wealth of the valley stops, and likewise if the laborers are not given decent wage, they too, must stop work, and the whole people of the country will stop with them.



"We assert that if the police authorities had done their duty many arrests would have been made among the occupants of the company's house from which the volleys of bullets came. In view of the fact that many disorderly men have lately been induced to come to Oxnard by the Western Agricultural Contract Company, and that they took part in the assaults of Monday afternoon, we demand that the police do not longer neglect their duty, but arrest those persons who plainly participated in the fatal shooting.

(Signed)

J. M. LIZARRARAS,

Secretary of the Mexican branch of the Japanese-Mexican Protective Association.

Y. YAMAGACHI,

Secretary of the Japanese branch of the Japanese-Mexican Protective Association."

Frightened at the turn things had now taken, Major Driffel, of the Beet Sugar Company, asked for a joint meeting of committees from the unions, the farmers and the company. The first day's conference came to nothing, but at the second meeting the employers realized that they were facing a labor trust that had cornered all the available labor power in the valley, and so the men's scale of prices was agreed to, with an additional pledge that all the idle union men would be immediately employed.

Twice, after this, the company tried to import a carload of scabs from Los Angeles—even going so far as to lock the last shipment in its car and receive them at the station with armed guards—but each time the new men joined the union as soon as they reached Oxnard—the last lot escaping from the car windows.

At this juncture, the Los Angeles County Council of Labor passed resolutions favoring the organization of all Asiatics now in California. This was done upon the recommendation of Comrade F. C. Wheeler, organizer for the A. F. of L. in Southern California, who had visited Oxnard, organized the two unions, and was much impressed by their fighting qualities.

So far everything was well with the beet thinners, the company whipped in the first battle of the local class-war and the field hands unionized. But a most unexpected and disheartening blow capped the climax of their struggles—a blow from behind. Samuel Gompers, while granting the Mexicans all rights and privileges, refused to grant the Japanese union a charter, and in his letter to Secretary Lizarraras made the following remarkable statement:

"It is further understood that in issuing this charter to your union, it will under no circumstance accept membership of any Chinese or Japanese. The laws of our country prohibit Chinese

workmen or laborers from entering the United States, and propositions for the extension of the exclusion laws to the Japanese have been made on several occasions."

In making such an extraordinary ruling, President Gompers has violated the expressed principles of the A. F. of L., which states that race, color, religion or nationality, shall be no bar to fellowship in the American Federation of Labor.

California, alone, contains over forty thousand Japanese who, if unorganized, will be a continuous menace to union men.

"Better go to hell with your family than to heaven by yourself," said the speaker whose stirring words decided the Mexican union to send back its charter to President Gompers, along with the following letter:

"OXNARD, CAL., June 8, 1903.

"Mr. Samuel Gompers, Pres. American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.

"DEAR SIR: Your letter of May 13, in which you say: 'The admission with us of the Japanese Sugar Beet & Farm Laborers into the American Federation of Labor cannot be considered,' is received.

"We beg to say in reply that our Japanese brothers, here, were the first to recognize the importance of co-operating and uniting in demanding a fair wage scale.

"They are composed mostly of men without families, unlike the Mexicans in this respect.

"They were not only just with us, but they were generous. When one of our men was murdered by hired assassins of the oppressors of labor, they gave expression of their sympathy in a very substantial form.

"In the past we have counceled, fought and lived on very short rations with our Japanese brothers, and toiled with them in the fields, and they have been uniformly kind and considerate. We would be false to them and to ourselves and to the cause of Unionism if we, now, accepted privileges for ourselves which are not accorded to them. We are going to stand by men who stood by us in the long, hard fight which ended in a victory over the enemy. We therefore respectfully petition the A. F. of L. to grant us a charter under which we can unite all the Sugar Beet & Field Laborers of Oxnard, without regard to their color or race. We will refuse any other kind of charter, except one which will wipe out race prejudices and recognize our fellow workers as being as good as ourselves.

"I am ordered by the Mexican union to write this letter to you and they fully approve its words.

J. M. LIZARRARAS,  
Sec'y S. B. & F. L. Union, Oxnard."



The Japanese are publishing two papers in San Francisco, and another will be printed in Los Angeles by Mr. Shibuya as soon as the expected type arrives from Japan, so it can be easily seen how important their members would be to organized labor in the West. To Socialists they are particularly attractive, as the Japanese have proven themselves to be apt students of the international working-class movement that believes in a common ownership of the means of production and distribution. Their leaders in California—I speak of those whom I have met and talked with—one and all regard Socialism to be the logical conclusion of the trades union movement. The opposition of their entrance into the A. F. of L. can only be temporary, as the unions of Southern California are practically unanimous in their favor, and I hear that, since the writing of Gompers' letters, the National executive is reconsidering its action.

But the interesting phase to the student, in all this, is the evidence offered by the Oxnard episode to the effect that labor, like capital, knows neither race prejudice nor national tradition when the class struggle is on. Even the Chinese in Oxnard—there were very few of them—aligned themselves with the unions, for they, too, wished to better their material conditions—a desire, international, within the breast of man.

I cannot avoid the conclusion, forced on me by my contact with the Japanese and Mexicans in California—where they have of their own volition been organizing—that a social revolution is as possible among these people as any in the world, providing their immediate environment is the same. In fact, there is history making in China, to-day, that must lead a sound Marxian to feel no surprise if the conquest of private capital may not be first accomplished in Cathay.

*John Murray, Jr.*

## The Wage Slave

ONLY a child of the tenement,  
Palid and weak, with slight form bent,  
Suffering from hunger and cold;  
Hurrying along with the bustling throng—  
She doth to the wage-slave band belong,  
And only ten years old.

Only a child of the tenement,  
Body with pain and hunger rent,  
Bound by the curse of gold  
To toil all day that another may feast,  
To toil all day for a cruel beast,  
To be in luxury lolled.

Only a child of the tenement,  
With never a moment of sweet content  
To ease her life of toil;  
No song escapes her lips at morn—  
In brooding silence her heart forlorn  
Has naught despair to foil.

Only a child of the tenement,  
Sick at heart and soul most spent,  
Works on with choking breath;  
Works on all day amid whirring wheels,  
And ever at her aching heart feels  
The icy hand of death.

Only a child of the tenement,  
Marred by the hand of man and sent  
Forth beneath the cruel rod;  
Its pure soul marred because of love withheld,  
And on darkening wings at last impelled  
Onward to meet its God.

Only a child of the tenement,  
Crushed 'neath a cruel beam and sent  
Forth, alone, to meet its God;  
But blood is cheap and bread is dear,  
Another child with face sad and drear,  
Bows low beneath the rod.



Only a child of the tenement--  
To greed and pleasure our minds are lent,  
    And think not what made her so—  
The child of want, and sorrow, and pain,  
With never a ray of sunlight lain,  
    Along the way which she must go.

Only a child of the tenement,  
Yet shaped by the hand of God and meant  
    To bear His form divine.  
O, men, if men ye be, and wring  
Not from the tyrant Greed his baleful sting,  
    Then his sin is also thine.

*D. U. Cochrane.*

## Australian Labor and Socialist News

**T**HE engine drivers and firemen of Victoria came out on strike on May 8. A long series of petty tyrannies and flagrant injustices have been the real cause of the trouble. The minister for railways has earned for himself the unenviable title of Bully Bent.

The civil service in Victoria have recently been granted special parliamentary representation; the railway employes were given the privilege of electing one whole member themselves. The railway employes resented this as an interference with the secrecy of the ballot, and smarting under Bent's bullying ways, decided to affiliate with the other Victorian unions. The government demanded their withdrawal from the affiliated body of unions—the Trades Hall. Some of the railway workers complied with this demand, but the engine drivers and firemen, with several other unions, refused to withdraw. The government again issued an ultimatum, again demanding their withdrawal before May 12. The engine drivers and firemen decided to anticipate them, and accordingly the strike commenced on May 8. Double pay, promotion and all manner of inducements were offered by the railway department, but out of a union numbering between 1,300 and 1,400 all came out but 15.

On the 9th of May only two trains were run in Victoria and the commercial world was completely paralyzed. Factories had to slacken hands and the business of the community generally was thrown into disorder. The strike was hailed with approval in labor circles throughout Australia, and it was thought we were on the eve of a labor revival. The Victorian government, at their wit's end, summoned parliament and introduced a bill for the suppression of the strike. All strikers were liable to a fine of £100 or twelve months imprisonment, the distributing of monies, holding monies for strikers, persuading persons not to scab, holding meetings, sympathizing with strike, etc., were breaches of the act. Scabs meanwhile were being brought from all parts of Australia, but still the Victorian train service was in a state of chaos. All Australia regarded the strike as being almost won, for it was felt that the Victorian government would not have the courage to enforce the bill when passed, and it was known that the men were as firm as ever. On the 15th of May the strike was declared off, to the amazement of both sympathizers and men. The secretary and president of the union had declared the strike off without consulting the men or even the strike executive! These two officials betrayed their trust, and their action

should be another warning to the workers not to give too much power to their leaders.

This strike has caused great anxiety to the state Socialists. They do not want anything else "nationalized" under Bent. They are joining with other labor reformers in urging the claims of conciliation and arbitration. Although some of these people will tell you that our government and courts are conducted in the interests of one class, they seem to think that the arbitration court will be different. In New Zealand, the home of compulsory arbitration, dissatisfaction with the decisions of the Board of Conciliation is growing. Already in New South Wales, where this method of settling disputes has not been in vogue twelve months, the Newcastle coal miners have petitioned for an amendment in the act. In Western Australia the Arbitration and Conciliation Act is being administered in such a way that every union which registers under it must be limited to one trade. The working of the act there is resolving the federated unions into disunited, petty and isolated ones.

Some kindly-disposed syndicate, having an eye to the workers' interests, or to their pockets, propose the establishment of a labor daily in Sydney. It is proposed that the unions should procure 50,000 subscribers in return for which they have power to appoint three directors to control the policy of the paper, but these directors are to have nothing whatever to do with the business management. The names of the promoters of this scheme have not been disclosed. They should know, however, that if 50,000 unionists put their heads together they can run a paper without the aid of the benevolent syndicate.

*Andrew M. Anderson.*



## Socialism in Bohemia

**B**OHEMIAN Socialists, like the Bohemian nation itself, are unknown away from home. Thus the Germans, our nearest neighbors, give the name of "boehmische Dorf" (a Bohemian village) to anything unknown. Such a state of things is bad for a nation. It is the smaller peoples who have the greater need, if not of sympathy, from the foreigner, at least of being known by him. We see this very clearly in the Magyars. These have persuaded the whole world that they were a chivalric nation, burning with love for the ideal of liberty, but unfortunately always oppressed by a foreign government, a brutal government which does not permit the necessary national development. Every one is now convinced of that, and the Magyars, sure of the sympathy of Europe, are today oppressing in the most brutal and cynical fashion all the other nations in Hungary, the Slavs, the Roumanians, the Servians, and even the Germans. The ruling class persecutes the workingmen in their organizations in a fashion unparalleled in Europe. And the oppressed, the persecuted, cannot hold up this brutality to public scorn because no one would believe the chivalric Magyars capable of such brutality.

The Bohemians today are not in a situation like that of the nations oppressed by the Magyars. But it rests with us to guard against that very thing in the future. To that end we have need of the sympathies of Europe. That is true for the whole nation, it is still truer for the Bohemian Socialists. If Socialism in Bohemia is to develop, the Bohemian Socialist Party must be recognized as on an equality with all other Socialist parties, as a party filling well its place in the International Socialist movement. It is necessary then that our foreign comrades know that this party exists, and that they become acquainted with its plan, its manner of propaganda, and the work before it.

But the Bohemians seem to be surrounded by a Chinese wall. Many times already we have taken the trouble to inform the German Socialist press regarding events in Bohemia. We have always received the same stereotyped answer: "It is impossible to publish the information you send. We have no room for things of this sort because our readers take no interest in them." If finally I add that the official journal of the Socialist Party in Austria, the *Arbeiterzeitung*, at Vienna, has no correspondent at Prague, I think every one will believe in my sincerity when I thank the editor of the *Humanite Nouvelle* for opening to me the

columns of this review to inform its readers of what is happening in Bohemia.

We have in Austria a central party which holds its congress every two years to control the action of the parliamentary group and to decide questions of programme and tactics. All administrative questions and all other questions which do not touch upon the programme and tactics of the central party are left to the national congresses. Our national parties are not divided according to territory but they are arranged on an ethnological basis.

The Bohemian Socialist party held its fifth congress on the 1st, 2d and 3d of November, 1902. Next year will be the twenty-fifth anniversary of the first congress of the Bohemian Socialist party. It was a secret congress in a tavern near Prague, where met the principal militant Socialists from all corners of Bohemia and Moravia—while trying to evade the attention of the police—to come to an agreement on the principles of the programme and the means of propaganda.

Today more than 200 delegates from Bohemia, Moravia and Lower Austria assemble in the great hall of a building which belongs to the printers' union. The Bohemian Socialist party is composed of local organizations. They have representatives which hold district meetings. The delegates from the districts form the national representation of the party.

In 1901 the party counted 338 local organizations in 32 districts; but there are also Socialists and Socialist organizations in 559 cities and villages where the party is not yet organized. Today, in 1901, it includes 68 political organizations, 417 labor unions, 397 educational associations, 60 mutual aid associations and 29 gymnastic and athletic associations, a total of 48,777 members. In 1901 the party arranged for 12,734 meetings. It is thus seen that neither the Austro-Hungarian empire, nor in Bohemia, nor in the municipality, can Socialism be treated as a negligible quantity.

To make action possible wherever necessary the party naturally has need of money. Its finances thus far have been well regulated. Every member is obliged to pay to the party each month about two-fifths of a cent through his local organization. The resources of the party are not large, but they are something, and that is an important advantage.

In its propaganda the party has found one very special obstacle, namely, the educational associations. In the time of the persecution of Socialism in Austria the Socialists could not organize in any other form than educational associations. At one time and another the members of these associations started sick benefit funds, etc. They are now tied to these funds, and when it is desired to establish a labor union the same objection is always heard: "We already have our association. We have no need of

another new one. We cannot be members of two associations because we cannot afford to pay dues to two groups."

The Federation of Unions has made great efforts to transform the educational associations into groups adhering to the central organization. It had, however, no success. It then invoked the aid of the Socialist party.

The fifth congress, which was held at Prague, November 1, 2 and 3, 1902, decided that the educational associations were an out-grown form which cannot exist in the present state of the working class organization, consequently it recommends its members to transform the educational associations into labor unions.

The party also has occasion to see the importance of the younger workingmen in the political movement. The young men furnished two or three years ago the framework for the new national labor party. The need is now recognized of filling the minds of the youth with Socialist ideas and carrying on an active propaganda in their ranks to bring them into Socialism. The party has recognized the gymnastic associations as a very useful means for arriving at this end. It accordingly advises the young to take part in them.

By the side of the associations exists the Socialist press, the great propagandist of Socialist ideas. It fights its numerous enemies; it defends the citizen against the government and its office holders, the workman against the employer and his assistants.

The Socialist press in Austria, and especially the Bohemian press, is, as in Germany, the property of the party; the central journal *Pravo Lidu* (People's Rights) at Prague, and the monthly review *Akademie* belong entirely to the party. The other Bohemian daily journal, *Delnické Listy* (Worker's Gazette), at Vienna—the only daily journal in Europe appearing in Bohemia outside of Bohemia and Moravia—and some other newspapers are the property of the national organizations, while all the others belong to the organizations of the electoral districts. The union papers are edited by their respective unions.

According to the report of the executive committee at the congress, the situation of the Bohemian Socialist press is as follows: The political press has two daily journals and twelve other organs (including a paper for agitation among women and another for agitation among the young); the union press has eighteen organs. Besides this the party possesses a monthly review, a weekly anti-clerical paper, a humorous paper and a monthly literary paper.

The press committee distributes each year a great number of pamphlets, but it also publishes important works for the Socialist movement.

The Socialist press cannot develop in Austria as in other countries, because with us the peddling of papers is forbidden. More-



over, the entire press is under the power of the procurator general, who can confiscate anything he chooses without any responsibility. This means that it is especially the Socialist press which feels this arbitrary power of the procurator general. But we now have a government with a president who would like people to believe that he is a man of modern ideas. This is united in him with a rare skill at promising every one something agreeable. Seeing that he can buy over all other political parties by promises, he thinks he may be able to gain over the Socialists also if he promises them to introduce a bill for a new law regarding the press. So he introduces it. But this so-called new law is but a poor copy of the German newspaper law of 1874. The Germans desire to repeal it, but it is still good enough for the Austrians.

This proposed law, it is true, limits at some points the omnipotence of the procurator general in the matter of confiscation, but it maintains confiscation in principle. It also maintains the prohibition of peddling papers, although the president of the council himself—the author of the project—was obliged to recognize in open chamber that this prohibition was an absolute anomaly, that it is in direct contradiction of the ideas and most primary demands of our time.

It goes without saying that the congress could not but give voice to the fact that this newspaper law was not agreeable from this point of view and consequently it was not acceptable to the Socialists. The Socialist party demands universal suffrage, and pensions for disease and old age. The fifth congress renewed these demands briefly and passed on to a very important point, to a discussion regarding the action of the Socialists in the municipalities.

The movement which carried the first Socialists into the municipal councils is a recent thing. We may state that this movement has not grown in any remarkable fashion except in the first elections in the fifth class. This is a class with universal suffrage, co-ordinate with the class of great agrarian proprietors, the class of the chambers of commerce, the class of the cities, the class of the provinces. The agitation which had taken place at the time of this election diffused Socialist ideas even into the most remote villages. The people instinctively regard Socialism as the voice of the oppressed, as the voice of the opposition. We have many examples of the opposition in the country towns presenting itself from that time on under the title of the Socialist party. The party is thus represented in 178 municipal councils by 526 municipal councilmen.

These are found either in the workingmen's villages on the outskirts of the industrial cities or in their more immediate neighborhood, especially in the coal fields, or in the little provincial towns, or again in the villages, where the struggle has

long existed between the large and the small agrarian proprietors. There still exists in Bohemia a vestige of the ancient community of property. The communal property belonged before 1864 to a certain number of proprietors who could use it as their own. But the law for the organization of townships could not preserve that right of the proprietors. It limited it in this way: The old proprietors can use this property only according to the needs of their households. It results from this that these proprietors often go further than the law allows, for they always regard the public property as their property, and forbid the small proprietors to use it. The latter now wish either to preserve the public property for the township and defend it against the ancient proprietors or to take a share in the robbery committed.

This opposition has need of a banner which permits the concentration of all the elements dissatisfied with the situation in the township. This banner is now Socialism.

It should therefore be no cause for astonishment that many of the municipal councilmen elected under the title of "Socialists" do not always act according to the programme of the Socialist party. The Bohemian Socialist party has for three years had its municipal programme, but most of the Socialist municipal councilmen have not had time to read it or study it.

The Socialist workingmen elected in the villages are not independent. They depend upon the employer, who is also nearly always a member of the municipal council, and he throws the municipal councilmen who are workingmen out on the street if they wish to do anything he does not accept.

The result of the action of the Socialists in the townships is not satisfactory. The fifth congress recognizes that it is necessary to impose upon the municipal councilmen who belong to the Socialist party a strong control on the part of the local organizations of the districts. The congress recommended to the organizations to aid the municipal councilmen by their advice and to interfere always if they see that the action of the municipal council, especially the action of the Socialist members, does not correspond to the programme of the party. The executive committee has been invited to convoke from time to time congresses of municipal councilmen. The party press must accord more attention to municipal Socialism than it has done up to this time.

That is the most important resolution that the fifth congress took. The circumstances of Bohemia oblige us to be attentive to this opposition movement in the township. Well directed it will enable us to diffuse our ideas and to increase the chances of the Socialistic party in future electoral campaigns.

*Dr. Leon Winter, in L'Humanite Nouvelle, translated by Charles H. Kerr.*

## Political Problems in Germany

**E**VEN the mentally most inert Philistine and the most brainless minister of state will now certainly stir from his stupor and anxiously inquire, "What next?" writes Comrade Kautsky in a recent issue of the *Neue Zeit*. "He must realize that things can no longer continue as heretofore, that the so-called 'fight with the weapons of the mind' against Socialism is a total failure. This fight has never been much more than a string of misquotations for the purpose of proving that the strongest party in Germany is composed of a lot of idiots, scoundrels and vandals. And it is the sum total of the intellectual ammunition which the bourgeoisie used against us during the recent campaign."

But a thorough bourgeois never learns anything. Says the *Neue Zeit* editorially in its issue of July 4: "One would think that those diminutive fractions of the bourgeois left would bethink themselves a little after the crushing defeat which they have suffered. During the first few days after the catastrophe, they indeed made some desultory remarks that might have caused some unusually confiding mind to harbor the expectation that they would repent in sack and ashes. But this mood passed off rapidly, and to-day they are once more masters of the situation. It is not the *Berliner Tageblatt*, not the *Frankfurter Zeitung*, nor any of the other charming members of that newspaper family, that have received a shameful drubbing in the elections, but rather—the Social Democracy is once more on the eve of its internal dissolution, or it is in the moulting stage toward liberal radicalism, or—well, in short, it is really the Socialist party that has lost the electoral battle, and we should be thankful to at last follow the wise counsels of those honest papers."

According to the capitalist press, the Socialist party is once more on the verge of disruption, because—lo and behold!—Comrade Edward Bernstein has stirred up a little storm in a teacup about non-essentials by an article in the *Socialistische Monatshefte*, in which he warms up the old contention that the Socialist party should assert its right to the vice-presidency in the Reichstag. Of course, for Bernstein and his opportunist friends this matter is by no means unessential, but of the gravest diplomatic consequences. Our great revolutionist friend inflates this vice-presidential bubble into a mighty balloon which will carry the Socialist party, in his opinion, from a position of cold and unsympathetic criticism to one of fruitful and effective



political activity. He declares that no principle will be violated by accepting the representative duties of this position together with the parliamentary duties, because "a visit to the emperor is a formality pure and simple" which does not in the least touch any of our fundamental principles. It is "purely an acknowledgement of the present political status, by which we do not in the least signify our adherence to the principles of monarchy." Moreover, "the imperial constitution, more than any other, stands in its origin and stipulations next to the principles of a republic." The constitution does not recognize the traditional rights of monarchs, because "it does not recognize an emperor of Germany, or an emperor of the Germans, but only a German emperor." In some parts of Germany the Socialist representatives are compelled to take the oath of allegiance, and "that is a much more serious matter than a simple visit to the emperor. A Socialist does not sacrifice his principles by making a visit, once or twice in the year, to the executive head of the state, as a representative of the elected representative authority, under the provisions of the constitution."

The capitalist press takes this very minor matter as seriously as does Bernstein himself. The *Nationalliberale Korrespondenz* declares that it does not wish to give rise to "the erroneous idea that only a certain part of the liberals is liberal enough to fully recognize the claim of the Socialists to the position of vice president. This is in no way the case. Especially in the national liberal party there is no desire to deny a claim that follows *per se* from the proportional strength of the various parties in the Reichstag." But the *National-Zeitung*, liberal radical organ, is not so willing to accede to the claims of the Socialists. If the Socialists should nominate Comrade Singer for this position, it would be "a matter of course that all parties of the right should refuse to sanction the choice, because "Singer, after being ordered to leave the session by authority of the rules of order, did not comply but violated these rules." In reality, Vice President von Stolberg ordered Comrade Singer out of the house by a flagrant breach of the rules, and the "liberal radical" organ champions this reactionary despotism. The conservative organs take it for granted that no Socialist can ever occupy the seat of vice president, because we are opponents of monarchy and would not rise to join in the customary homage to the emperor. The organs of the center party are divided. The *Centrums-Korrespondenz* and the *Koelner Volks-Zeitung* recall the fact that once upon a time the center party was treated by the parties of the right like Cinderella, but hedges on the question of the personalities to be nominated by the Socialists. And the *Germania*, after repeating the old lie that "the Social Democracy proclaims atheism," continues: "Let us wait

and see what the beginning of the reichstag session will bring in the matter of the vice presidency. If the majority of the Reichstag should offer the Socialists that position, they will hardly be so 'inhuman' and impolite as to refuse it. But if Mr. Paul Singer should be nominated by them, then the majority of the Reichstag will no doubt refuse to accept him" on the specious ground mentioned above. Besides, the clerical organ complains that "that no Socialist will accept the duties of representation connected with the vice presidency, or call for a 'Hoch' for the emperor, as required by the majority of the Reichstag and by the loyalty for the monarch."

*Vorwaerts* replies that "We are quite satisfied, if the center fraction will violate our good right by hypocritical interpretations. We are fully alive to the difficulties growing out of an acceptance of the vice presidency by a Socialist. And we offer no objection if the majority of the Reichstag will open the new session by a violation of justice, which will brand them as a reactionary mass opposed to the Socialist Party, a party representing three million working class votes."

Comrade Singer is much surprised at the stand taken by Bernstein. "It is queer," he says, "that the result of the elections, which opens up a great perspective for the future power of the party, should give Comrade Bernstein no other concern than the discussion of such a minor and unessential question. Power and influence are not vested in the vice presidency, but in the Reichstag. So far as urging a determined claim on the vice presidency is concerned, Bernstein is once again making an assault on an open door. There is no difference of opinion about that in the party. Speaking for myself, it seems to me that we shall insist on our claim, just as we did in 1898. It is also a matter of course that a Socialist vice president fulfills all the duties prescribed by *the rules of business*. We have so declared in the convention of seniors in 1898, when we made our claim to the vice presidency. But it was then sought to saddle certain *social* duties on us which are not provided for by the order of business. And when we declined to attend the imperial court our just claims were denied.

"I can see no reason for abandoning our standpoint, so much less as the vice presidency has not by far the importance attributed to it by Bernstein. \* \* \* Of course, it would do us no harm to have a Socialist vice president. But neither can I see what great differences it would make for us whether one of us could ring the presidential bell or not. I deny that there is any occasion for the party to covet that position at any cost. \* \* \* I lack the understanding for the necessity of opening up, without need, and immediately after a glorious campaign, such questions

as will give renewed countenance to the widespread legend of the fundamental differences of opinion among the Socialists. \* \* \*

The *Leipziger Volkszeitung*, the organ of the Leipsic Socialists, thinks that it is not worth while to enter into the sophisms of Bernstein at the present moment. But the *Volksfreund* of Karlsruhe is very angry at the insinuation that Bernstein's argument is based on sophisms and announces that there will be a great revisionist campaign in the near future. The *Neue Zeit* points out that "The priority for this idea of Bernstein's belongs to the *Berliner Tageblatt*. Bernstein has aroused a great enthusiasm in the radical press by mentioning the idea that the Socialist fraction of the Reichstag should translate the valiant and heroic battle of three millions into a courteous bow before the monarchic principle. The capitalist paper suggested the idea immediately after the main election. But however much it is otherwise inclined to demand credit, it has not insisted on its prior claims in this instance, but prefers to regard as the mightily rushing spring of Socialism that which is in reality only the sluggish flow of muddy water from its own pipes. It is jubilant over the impending admission of the Socialists at court, because Comrade Bernstein recommends that the new representatives of the party, at the command of the bourgeois majority, should stoop to an action which is repugnant to their political principles."

Bernstein's assertion that the German constitution is almost democratic elicits the following from the *Neue Zeit*: "We confess that we rubbed our eyes when we read that, for we thought we were dreaming. The origin of the German constitution is sufficiently known, and no one ever thought of denying that there was no constitution in Germany that had been made to such an extent without the people and its representatives, and so entirely by monarchs and princes, as the imperial constitution." The *Neue Zeit* strongly suspects that Bernstein does not know the literature dealing with the origin of this constitution, especially since he attributes such a high diplomatic value to the distinction between an emperor of Germany, an emperor of the Germans and a German emperor. The *Neue Zeit* then quotes from a work of Professor Lorenz, how the German emperor was the creation of the meanest intrigues of the German princes during the Franco-Prussian war. "When all these contemptible intrigues began to blossom out in their sins, Bismarck asked one of his conspirators what was the Latin word for sausage. When he was told that it was 'farcimentum' he joked about those fine diplomatic distinction now mentioned by Comrade Bernstein: '*Nescio quid mihi magis farcimentum esset*'—I don't know what would be more sausage to me—in other words, all kaisers look alike to me."



The *Neue Zeit* concludes by saying: "If those (capitalist) papers rejoice at Comrade Bernstein's proposition as if somebody had fried an extra sausage for them, then the party should, in our opinion, close the books for once and all in this matter of eternally revising our most elementary principles, by repeating the words of Bismarck: *Nescio quid mihi magis farcimentum esset*. We can really afford to do that after the 16th of June, and it would not be the least gratifying result of that glorious day."

While Bernstein, with characteristic opportunist smallness, is wasting time and paper on a bagatelle, Kautsky publishes an exhaustive and deep analysis of the new situation created by the result of the elections and the probable course to be followed by the government against the Socialists. He shows that the government has two ways to oppose us: Either by weakening the proletariat through a corruption of its leaders. This method is hopeless in Germany. It is also futile to hope for success by trying the tactics of the English bourgeoisie against the trade unions. The German trade unions have a generation of class conscious political action behind them, and the German bourgeoisie is not as strong as the English. The other method is brutal suppression of political rights under the leadership of the army officers, the representatives of the aristocrats. Kautsky thinks that the growth of the Socialist movement will increase this tendency toward violent methods, but that the reaction of to-day is not as strong as it was in the years following 1848. "Then it followed in the wake of the violent suppression of the revolutionary classes and countries; today it grows with the continuous increase of the revolutionary masses. Then it drew its strength from the complete helplessness of the masses against the government; to-day it is accompanied by a growing rebellion against the ruling regime. Then it was mainly supported by a strong government, behind which stood a small but aggressive caste of nobles; today the government as a reactionary factor is far outdone by the reactionary parties, and these are not produced by one class, but by various classes with different interests and methods of warfare. It is extremely difficult to unite them all under one leadership, and it is impossible to keep them permanently together for united action." \* \* \* This dissolution of the reactionary elements is furthermore offset by the fact that with the decline of liberalism the revolutionary Socialists become more and more a political necessity. "Liberalism is dead, and a strong Socialist Party alone offers the possibility to protect the German nation against brainless experiments and to do justice to the most elementary needs of the economic and intellectual development."

From these premises Kautsky concludes that "a regime of great political and economic reforms is excluded by the present situation. But neither is a regime of permanent restriction and violent suppression of the proletarian movement probable, although it is more likely to be tried than an era of reform. However, if it should come to such a regime of the 'strong man,' and he should succeed in stifling some of the signs of life of the Socialist Party for a short time, it could only be a regime so absolutely out of harmony with the requirements of modern life, so narrow and stupid, that it would soon bring Germany to the verge of ruin and face to face with a catastrophe, which would result in a much greater victory of the Socialist Party and in the conquest of the political power by the proletariat."

The probable policy, according to Kautsky, will be one of inconsistency, vacillating between concession and violent repression. To those who would derive from such inconsistency the hope that the government might try to seek a *modus vivendi* with the Socialists, if they would accept the tactics of state Socialism, Kautsky answers: "This is a conception which looks very clever, but is in reality extremely foolish, because it neglects the economic basis of things. It emanates from the premise that the governments derive their powers from within themselves, as if they were not dependent on the ruling classes."

It follows from the foregoing that the work of the Socialist representatives will largely deal with the problems mapped out by the so-called immediate demands. *Vorwaerts* of July 4 declares that the Socialists will more than ever demand a fulfillment of its social duties from the government. They must try to obtain the legal eight-hour day, combat female and child labor, provide for greater protection of the employes of house industries, and meet the problems of factory inspection and workingmen's insurance. The problem of the unemployed and of providing for widows and orphans of the working class should also be solved in the next Reichstag.

But whether the Socialists will succeed in obtaining these demands or not, *Vorwaerts* is certain that the German working class will not permit the ruling classes any longer to rest in sloth and idleness. "The working men will press the spur of critique into the flanks of the class state, until it starts ahead—toward the final goal, *Socialism*."

Ernest Untermann.

## Economic Aspects of Chattel Slavery

*(Continued from last issue.)*

**A**T the formation of the union the rice of Georgia and South Carolina and the tobacco of Virginia were almost the only crops which demanded slave labor for their cultivation. These two crops were much too limited in importance to constitute the basis of a wide-spread industrial organization, such as that to which chattel slavery later gave rise.

It was a revolution in the field of manufacture, that, finally reacting upon agriculture, fastened chattel slavery upon the Southern States of America. The inventions of Hargreave and Arkwright mightily increased the demand for cotton. But the raising of cotton was restricted by the difficulty of separating the cotton fibre from the seed. On this point I quote from Census Bulletin of 1900, No. 206 (page 10): "Prior to the invention of the cotton gin by Eli Whitney in 1794, the separation of the seed from the lint had to be done by hand, a task being four pounds of lint cotton per week for each head of the family, working at night in addition to the usual field work. Thus it would take one person two years to turn out the quantity of cotton contained in one average standard bale. One machine will gin from three to fifteen 500-pound bales per day, dependent upon its power and saw capacity. While several machines had been invented for the seeding of cotton, it was reserved for Eli Whitney to inaugurate, by his invention, the era which was to perfect the industry of 'cotton ginning' and revolutionize the culture and commerce of the staple."

And also on page 11: "Possibly no invention ever caused so rapid a development of the industry with which it was associated as that brought through the saw cotton gin. In 1793 the exportation of cotton from the United States was 487,500 pounds, or 975 bales of an average weight of 500 pounds. In 1794, the year in which the Whitney gin was patented, the number of pounds of cotton exported from the United States was 1,600,000, equivalent to 3,200 bales of a 500-pound standard."

In "Eighty Years' Progress of the United States" an article by Prof. C. F. McCay, of Columbia College, South Carolina, Page 113-14, says: "The introduction of Whitney's gin acted like magic on the planting of cotton. In eight years, from 1792 to 1800, the exports of the United States increased more than a hundred-fold. The value rose from \$30,000 to \$3,000,000, and



the amount from 138,000 pounds to 18,000,000. The whole of this was wanted in England, and the rapid increase in the demand there that followed the general introduction of Arkwright's inventions prevented any decline in price. The population of South Carolina and Georgia, where all of the cotton was raised, was only 507,000 in 1800; so that the amount was \$6 to each individual, including young and old. . . . In the next ten years, from 1801 to 1810, the production increased more than five-fold, from 18,000,000 to 93,000,000 of pounds, and the value from \$3,000,000 to \$15,000,000. As the population had only increased 30 per cent in these ten years, and as the expense of cotton and rice had risen from 94,000 to 119,000 tierces, the great change was in the transfer of labor from tobacco to cotton. The exports of cotton and rice in 1810 were more than \$30 to each person, white and black, young and old, male and female; an amount which sufficiently indicates that nearly the whole available labor was devoted to these two staples."\*

So it was that within a short time cotton had risen to be a dominant element in the industrial life of the South, and indeed almost of the United States and we find the cry of King Cotton being taken up by the defenders of the Southern system. In a book which was extensively circulated as constituting a sort of official statement of the slaveholders' position entitled "Cotton is King" by "An American," we have this summed up as follows, page 98: "Nearly all the cotton consumed in the Christian world is the product of the slave labor of the United States. It is this monopoly that has given slavery its commercial value; and while this monopoly is retained the institution will continue to extend itself wherever it can find room to spread." This same author sums up the facts as to the industrial position of slave labor and the crops which were its necessary base as follows (Page 54): "Slave labor has seldom been made profitable where it has been wholly employed in grazing and grain growing; but it becomes remunerative in proportion as the planters can devote their attention to cotton, sugar, rice, or tobacco. To render southern slavery profitable in the highest degree therefore, the slaves must be employed upon some one of these articles and be sustained by a supply of food and draught animals from Northern agricultural States."

Soon, however, it began to be apparent that the bargain of the Constitution could not remain a permanent one. The two forms of the organization of industry gave rise to the two divergent social systems, and consequently to two ruling social classes with opposing interests. It was inevitable that both of these should struggle for control of the government. Both of them

---

\*See Thomas P. Kettel "Southern Wealth and Northern Profits." pp. 20-24.

were compelled to grow or die, and it was in the struggle for the control of new territory that the contest became of greatest importance. This conflict had really begun to make its appearance before the Revolution. Horace Greeley, in his "History of the Struggle for Slavery Extension or Restriction in the United States," page 5, tells us that "When North Carolina and Georgia ceded their western lands, they especially provided that slavery should not be interfered with in any States that might be made from this territory." The Ordinance of 1787, however, which was formulated by Jefferson, and provided for the organization of the territory northwest of the Ohio river, contained the section which has become so famous forbidding "slavery or involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted."

It is interesting to note the vote on this Ordinance (Bancroft's History of Constitution of United States, Vol. 1, p. 115): "The great statute forbidding slavery to cross the river Ohio was passed by the vote of Georgia and South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, New Jersey, New York and Massachusetts, all the States that were then present in Congress. . . . Everyone said 'Aye' excepting Abraham Yates, of New York."

Woodrow Wilson, in his "History of American People," Vol. 4, pp. 101-102, covers this point so thoroughly that I can do no better than to quote him entire: "The chief choice always to be made at every stage of the unhalting westward movement was the choice concerning slavery; the choice which had been debated very temperately at first when the great Ordinance for the government of the Northwest Territory was adopted in the days of the Confederation, but which had struck many a spark of passion out when handled again at the admission of Missouri into the Union, and which seemed every time it was touched more dangerous and disturbing than before. Now it seemed to lie everywhere at the front of affairs—not the question of the abolition of slavery, but the question of its territorial extension. \* \* \* Slavery within the States which were already members of the Union was an institution with which the Federal government could have nothing to do, which no opinion even could touch or alter, save the opinion of the States concerned; a question of domestic law in respect of which the choice of each little commonwealth was sovereign and final. Had the full roster of the States been made up, agitators in Congress would have found themselves obliged to confine their attacks to the slave trade in the District of Columbia and the commerce in slaves between the States. But the full roster of the States was not made up; all the great Louisiana purchase remained to be filled with them; and with the making of every community there must come again

this question of the freedom of labor or the extension of slavery. The fateful choice was always making and to be made."

So it was that there were continually attempts on the part of the slave States to reconsider the decision which they had made during the confederation with regard to the exclusion of slaves from the Northwest Territory. The full history of these efforts is to be found in Wilson's "Rise and Fall of Slave Power in America," Vol. I, pp. 32-33, and in the work by Greeley, to which reference is made above, page 6, *et seq.* The following quotation from the latter work concerning one of these efforts is particularly interesting, because of the light which it throws on the attitude of one who was to play a prominent part in the anti-slavery agitation of later years. This incident took place March 2, 1803: "John Randolph was chairman of a committee having consideration of a proposal to suspend the slavery section of the Ordinance of 1787, which reported unanimously as follows: 'The rapid population of the State of Ohio sufficiently evinces in the opinion of your committee that the growth of slaves is not necessary to promote the growth and settlement of colonies in that great region. That this labor—*demonstrably the dearest of any*—can only be employed in the cultivation of products more valuable than any known to that quarter of the United States; that the Committee deem it highly dangerous and inexpedient to impair a provision wisely calculated to promote the happiness and prosperity of the northwestern country, and to give strength and security to that extensive frontier. In the salutary operation of this sagacious and benevolent restraint, it is believed that the inhabitant of Indiana will at no very distant day find ample remuneration for a temporary privation of labor and emigration.'

One of the most aggravating things about the chattel slavery movement from the point of view of the Northern capitalist was the way in which it used the central government to obtain new territory. It bought up Florida from Spain and fomented and carried to a successful conclusion an aggressive war with Mexico, lobbied through the Gadsden purchase, while at the same time it released without a struggle territory along the Northern boundary which would have been closed to slaves had it been acquired.

Meantime the two forms of society were growing further and further apart. The North was becoming more and more of a manufacturing country. It was the age of machinery. (Woodrow Wilson, "A History of the American People," p. 132): "A great tide of immigration, moreover, began to pour in, such as the country had never seen before. Until 1842 there had never been so many as a hundred thousand immigrants in a single year; but in 1845 there were two hundred and fourteen thousand, and by 1849 there were two hundred and ninety-seven thousand com-



ing in within a twelvemonth, the tide rising steadily from year to year. These were years of deep distress over sea. 1846 and 1847 were the years of terrible famine in Ireland; 1848 saw European States shaken once again by revolution. Not only men out of Ireland, looking for a land where there was food, but men also out of the old monarchies of the Continent, looking for a land where there was liberty—men of wholly foreign speech and habit, seeking a free place for a new life, bent upon their own betterment, and thinking little of aught that did not touch their own fortunes—came crowding endlessly in. They did not go into the South, where labor was not free, for they were laborers. They crowded rather, into the cities of the North, or pushed on to the virgin West.”

Another point on which the interests of the ruling class of the two sections were antagonistic was on the question of the tariff. This point is so thoroughly covered, and that from the materialist point of view by the writers of the time, that I can do no better than to quote their words:

“The close proximity of the provision and cotton growing districts of the United States gave its planters advantages over all other portions of the world. But they could not monopolize the market, unless they could obtain a cheap supply of food and clothing for their negroes and raise their cotton at such reduced prices as to undersell their rivals. A manufacturing population, with its mechanical coadjutors, in the midst of the provision growers, on a scale such as the protective policy contemplated, it was conceived, would create a permanent market for their products and enhance the price, whereas, if their manufacturing could be prevented, and a system of free trade adopted, the South would constitute the principal provision market of the country, and the fertile lands of the North supply the cheap food demanded for its slaves. As the tariff policy, in the outset, contemplated the encouragement of iron, hemp, whisky, and the establishment of woollen manufactures principally, the South found its interests but slightly identified with the system.

“If they (the Southern planters) could establish free trade, it would insure the American market to foreign manufacturers, secure the foreign markets for their leading staple, repress home manufactures, force a large number of the Northern men into agriculture, multiply the growth and diminish the price of provisions, feed and clothe their slaves at lower rates, produce their cotton for a third or fourth of former prices, and rival all other countries in its cultivation, monopolize the trade in the article throughout the whole of Europe, and build up a commerce and a navy that would make us the rulers of the seas.”\*

---

\*From “Cotton is King” by “An American.”

On pages 80-81 he continues as follows: "They understood the protective policy as contemplating the support of our country with home-manufactured articles to the exclusion of those of foreign countries. This would confine the planters in the sale of this cotton, mainly to the American market, and leave them in the power of monied corporations, which, possessing the ability, might control the prices of their staple, to the irreparable injury of the South. With slave labor they could not become manufacturers, and must, therefore, remain at the mercy of the North, both as to food and clothing, unless the European markets should be retained. Out of this conviction grew the war upon corporations; the hostility to the employment of foreign capital in developing the mineral, agricultural and manufacturing resources of the country; the efforts to destroy the bonds and the credit system; the attempts to reduce the currency to gold and silver; the system of collecting the public revenues in coin; the withdrawal of public moneys from all banks, as a basis of paper circulation; and the sleepless vigilance of the South, in resisting all systems of internal improvements by the general government. Its statesmen foresaw that a paper currency would keep up the price of Northern products 100 or 200 per cent above the specie standard; that the combination of capitalists, whether engaged in manufacturing wool, cotton, or iron, would draw off labor from the cultivation of the soil, and cause large bodies of the producers to become consumers, and that roads and canals, connecting the West with the East, were effectual means of bringing the agricultural and manufacturing classes into closer proximity, to the serious limitation of the foreign commerce of the country, the checking of the growth of the navy and the manifest injury of the planters."

(Page 83): "The vote of the West during the struggle was of the first importance, as it possessed the balance of power, and could turn the scale at will. It was not left without inducements to co-operate with the South, in its measures for extending slavery that it might create a market among the planters for its products."

This struggle soon extended into a contest to obtain the votes of the Western States, and both parties began to appeal to the interests of the small farmer class of the Middle West. The chattel slave owner pointed out to the farmer of the West that the slave economy demanded the purchase of mules, corn, cattle and hay which was raised in that section. So long as the main avenues of communication between this territory and the outside world consisted of the Mississippi river and its tributaries this argument was of great strength. The South always sought to keep the Mississippi river open, while over and over again the

New England states showed apathy, not to say hostility, to the improvement of Mississippi navigation.

The Southern position is thus stated by S. S. Marshall in "The Real Issue, Union or Disunion," published in 1856, where he claims that the New England states have always opposed the West and says they fought to open the Mississippi to trade.

"Not because it was a slave territory, but distinctly on the ground that if the people of the West were allowed a free access to the Gulf of Mexico the immigration thereby induced would cripple the commerce of New England. \* \* \* But the gallant South came to our rescue and with Jefferson at their head, Louisiana was acquired, the fetters struck off from western commerce and a career of prosperity opened up to us unexampled in the history of the world."

The Northern capitalists appealed to the Western farmer on the ground that the establishment of manufactures would furnish a market for the raw material which he could produce. Very soon the political party of the North began to stand for internal improvements in addition to a protective tariff. They sought thereby to bring the Western farmer, trader and producer of raw material in general in closer connection with their manufactures.

This question of the social effects of routes of communication with the Northwest was summed up as follows by an anonymous observer in a work entitled "The Effect of Secession upon the Commercial Relations toward the United States," which was printed in London in 1861:

(Pp. 37 *et seq*): "A few years ago the only method of getting the produce of the greater portion of the Western states to market was to float it by its own gravity down the Mississippi \* \* \* The consumers of this product lay to the northeast, rendering necessary a circuit of some 7,000 miles to reach districts separated only by as many hundred. The people of New York, consequently, set to work to open another outlet for the great valley, in effect to turn its great river into their magnificent harbor." (Then describes how Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, Indiana and Illinois constructed canals leading in the same direction.) "These works, which at the time they were commenced were regarded as superior to all other modes of transportation of property, as well as persons, led to a great change in the direction of western produce. Instead of being sent, every pound of it, down the Mississippi, as formerly, increasing quantities were turned into the new routes.

"But canals could be constructed only in a few localities. A new and more efficient agency, the greatest achievement of modern times, the railroad, came into play. Practicable everywhere, they were commenced in every part of the country and in the decade just closed more than 10,000 miles have been constructed

in the Northwestern states alone. \* \* \* The cost of the works constructed to change the direction of the commerce of the Mississippi cannot be less than \$500,000,000, or about one-half the cost of all the railroads and canals of the United States.

"The results accomplished have been as vast as the means employed, forty-nine-fiftieths of all the produce of the free states of the West are turned over the new channels leading directly to the districts of consumption. The importance of the Mississippi river and its outlets as channels of commerce has been reduced in an equal degree."

As the slavery contest progressed it brought out many interesting points in the way of comparison between wage labor and chattel slavery. Both parties of course declared that they were waging the struggle for the benefit of the subject classes. To be sure, the chattel slavery owner was a little more frank than the bourgeois buyer of wage labor and admitted that he was seeking his own interest. Yet, as we shall see later, he took good care to persuade the non-slave holding white population that the interests of "the South" were bound up in slave holding. The Northern abolitionists continually told stories of the horrors of Southern slavery, which stories reached their climax in "Uncle Tom's Cabin." While there is no doubt that everything described in this book might be found in the South, and I have not the slightest desire to minimize the damnable character of chattel slavery, yet the fact is that nearly everything it describes, with the exception of the blood hounds and rawhides, applies also to wage slavery.

The Southern chattel slave owners were quick to see this point, even though they did not dare to press it too closely lest it might endanger the entire system of exploitation. One of the favorite arguments made by the defenders of chattel slavery was to point to the large number of paupers which were to be found throughout the Northern states as a proof of the inferior condition of the wage-worker. Osgood Mussey, of Cincinnati, made the most naive reply to this allegation in a pamphlet published in 1849: "The native paupers of the Western states come mostly from this class, the laboring class, represented in the South by slaves. There is one saving clause at the latter end of the slave compact—that the master upon appropriating the whole active life of the slave must support him in his old age. Is not this pauperism?"

\* \* \* Like this compact between the master and slave-labor  
 \* \* \* so is the maxim which governs the relation of society and the poor within the free states—that it is the duty of the wealth of the state to provide for the comfort of all, who, through disability, cannot provide themselves. In these states it is more economical to the public, and more comfortable to the recipients,



to collect them into houses, especially during the severity of the winters."

We have already noted the fact that even Wendell Phillips at this time argues for wage labor because the children of wage workers can be put to work earlier than those of slaves, and over and over again the superior productive power of wage labor is repeated. One of these arguments, because of the fact that it is the voice of an organization and that of a sect which has long been noted for its philanthropic motives, sets forth this position with considerable elaborateness. The quotation is taken from the report of a committee appointed at a meeting held in Friend's Hall, Philadelphia, in 1839:

"We think the mere maintenance is here overrated, perhaps, and the estimate of 50 freeman as equal to 300 slaves may be considered as an underrate of slave labor. The average cost of a slave is not less than \$500, the interest of which is \$30. The average serviceable period of a slave's life does not exceed 21 years, counting from his maturity; his annual depreciation, therefore, is \$24 yearly. His clothing can scarcely be less than \$16 a year. The incidental expenses of medical attendance, average overseership and loss of time by sickness, running away, etc., may be put at \$16 more, which together makes an annual amount of \$58. What the slave consumes and what he wastes by omission and commission will keep a free laborer, and the wages of the latter will not rate over \$85 in the South. But the slave does, on an average, only three-fourths the labor of a freeman at most, leaving a balance against each slave of \$21.50 per annum. To this must be added the slave's keeping when past labor, the progressive impoverishment of the land under slavery, and the many vexations that accompany the system, independent of its moral evils."

Perhaps one of the most striking illustrations of this point is in a quotation given by Helper in his "Impending Crisis," p. 363. He is quoting from the testimony of a West India planter: "In 1834 I came into possession of 257 slaves, under the laws of England, which required the owner to feed, clothe and furnish them with medical attendance. With this number I cultivated my sugar plantation until the Emancipation Act of August 1, 1838, when they all became free. I now hire a portion of those slaves, the best and cheapest, of course, as you hire men in the United States. The average number which I employ is 100, with which I cultivate more land at a cheaper rate and make more produce than I did with 257 slaves. With my slaves I made from 100 to 180 tons of sugar yearly. With 100 free negroes I think I do badly if I do not annually produce 250 tons."

Helper himself also goes into capitalistic ecstasies over the possibility of employment of white women and children under

wage slavery (p. 300): "We want to see more plowing or hoeing or raking or grain binding by white women in the Southern states; employment in cotton mills and other factories would be far more profitable and congenial to them, and this they shall have within a short period after slavery shall have been abolished." On the next page he quotes from Cassius M. Clay, of Kentucky, as follows (p. 301): "In the extreme South, at New Orleans, the laboring men—the stevedores, the hackmen on the levee, where the heat is intensified by the proximity of the red brick buildings—are all white men, and they are in the full enjoyment of health. But how about cotton? I am informed by a friend of mine—himself a slave-holder, and therefore good authority—that in northwestern Texas, among the German settlements, who, true to their national instincts, will not employ the labor of a slave, they produce more cotton to the acre, and of better quality, and selling at prices from a cent to a cent and a half a pound higher than that produced by slave labor."

And he quotes from Dr. Cartwright, of New Orleans, as follows: "Here in New Orleans the larger part of the drudgery—work requiring exposure to the sun, as railroad making, street paving, day driving, ditching and building—is performed by white people."

As the price of slaves grew higher in the South the care which the master took of them undoubtedly became greater. Kettel tells us in his "Southern Wealth and Northern Profits": "At the North, a horse of \$30 value has bestowed upon him a certain degree of care because of even that value; but when the price of the animal rises to five and ten thousand dollars, the care he receives becomes princely. \* \* \* Up to 1808, the New England trader would sell slaves in the South at £30 (\$135) each. At a succession sale in W. Baton Rouge, a few days since, the following enormous prices were paid for common field hands: One female negro and four young, \$5,650; one male, \$4,400; do do, \$3,475; do do, \$3,400; do do, \$3,305; do do, \$3,200. In Salina, Ala., a hand 24 years old brought \$2,245, a female \$3,205, another hand, \$2,050. These prices do not indicate merely that the hand is worth so much more because his services to humanity (!) have risen in that proportion, but they indicate that he has so much greater hold upon the consideration of his master. That not only his material well-being will be better cared for, but all cruelty, moral and physical, that might affect his health or diminish his usefulness, will be more strictly prohibited; that the powers of overseers will be restrained; that his moral culture as conducive to his physical usefulness will be cared for, and the path thus laid open to his highest mental and material development."

This same author tells us on p. 101 that "A considerable num-

ber of alien laborers have of late years been employed South in the winter in drainage and such employments, as careful masters think too unhealthy for valuable blacks."

The following quotations taken from "An Inquiry Into the Conditions and Prospects of the African Race in the United States" by "An American," published in 1839, will illustrate the attitude taken by some writers at this time. He says, on page 98, "as soon as the demand for manufacturing laborers shall be exhausted by the supply, competition will reduce the wages to a bare subsistence, and then the employer will control the laborer almost without responsibility."

But it remains for one James Shannon, in a pamphlet on "Domestic Slavery," printed in 1855, to set forth a harmony of interest doctrine in relation to chattel slavery that might well excite the admiration of Mark Hanna and the Civic Federation (p. 15): "The relation of master and slave is merely that of debtor and creditor extended; namely, to services for life. \* \* \* (p. 16) This relation (chattel slavery), too, when properly contemplated is much more independent, dignified and endearing than that of hireling. There is an identity of interest, and there frequently is and always should be one of sympathy between master and slave; but no such identity exists between *master* and *hireling*. \* \* \* It must not be forgotten or overlooked that the relations of master and slave are correlative and the duties of these relations reciprocal. Both legally and morally, the master as truly belongs to the slave for the performance of a master's duties as the slave belongs to the master for the performance (when able) of a slave's duties. In this respect each may with equal propriety be said to own the other. Hence, in decrepitude from sickness or old age, the slave can say, "I have all things and abound. I own a master, whose sole estate and whose own personal energies are pledged for my support." The slave is, therefore, independent and happy. Not so the poor hireling who is wholly dependent on his daily labor for his daily bread. In sickness or old age, and often at other times, his only prospect is starvation, or the repulsive charity of a selfish and often heartless world.

"In the very nature of things, then, no such identity of interest or sympathy of feeling can possibly exist between the master and the hired servant, as we have seen to exist between the master and slave. On the contrary, the relation of master and hired servant is purely mercenary, and the interest of the two parties antagonistic, rather than identical. Each is impelled continually by selfishness to obtain the greatest possible amount whether of service or of hire, for the least possible equivalent."

A. M. SIMONS.

(To be continued.)

## Metaphysics and Socialism

**I** sources from which all the article in the July number of critics. It is quite true, as y Wood Simons replies to her the REVIEW in which Mashe says, that there are two great HAVE read with interest tilosophy proceeds—idealism and materialism. But it appears to my mind that it makes no difference, so far as socialism is concerned, whether we derive our philosophy of first principles from the one or from the other.

The idealist says that the Absolute Spirit is striving to express itself outwardly through humanity in positive laws and institutions which shall make the ideas of truth and justice tangible realities; and that wicked men are trying to crush back the Spirit and prevent it from coming into light and life. Can anyone desire a better metaphysical ground for socialism than this?

The materialist, on the other hand, takes his departure from physical law, and sees in society and government, as actually existing, an organization which, to secure the well being of the few, dooms the great mass of mankind to a mutilated existence of ignorance, want and misery. And this basis of Socialism is quite as firm as that of the idealist.

Both idealist and materialist recognize the essential and basic truth that the human individual, in virtue of being born into the world, and without any further ground of claim, is entitled to the enjoyment of all the means necessary for the full development and perfection of his nature, physical, intellectual and moral. And I apprehend that it is not a matter of any moment whether we say with the idealist that this is a divine right, or with the materialist that the right accrues under the natural law.

It is worthy of mention in this connection that, in their great revolution, the French people, while openly professing the most thorough-going materialism, and boasting of it, manifested in their action a sublime idealism never before witnessed in the history of the world.

There is, then, not the least occasion for a quarrel among Socialists over the question of idealism and materialism. Plato was an idealist of the purest type. He believed, however, that to bring idealism to the people, economic conditions must first be remodeled so as to conform to justice, and he constructed a State in which these conditions would conform to this idea. His State is very far from what the twentieth century demands, but the principle of its construction stands like a rock. And it is not unworthy of notice that the first rough draft of the cöoperative



commonwealth came from the hands of Plato, the father of idealism in our western world.

In fact, Socialism and idealism have no point of contact. The region of the idealist is the supersensible—the *noumenal*, as Kant calls it. This region is confined to the consciousness of the individual, and in this region the individual has no manner of relation to other members of society, and hence, in this respect, he is outside the sphere of society. There is no earthly reason why idealist and materialist cannot fight side by side with equal zeal and enthusiasm in the great world-battle which is now on between humanity on the one side and the powers of darkness in high places on the other.

I heartily agree with the writer of the article above referred to, that: "Few indeed are the American scholars who would father the statement," made by her critic, that the freedom of Cuba and the acquisition of the Philippines was "in no degree prompted by the hope of economic benefits."

*William Macon Coleman.*

Washington, D. C.

## Oh, World's Oppressed!

O, WORLD'S oppressed of every name,  
Sustaining scorn, starvation, shame!  
Calling and calling: assuming control.  
Hark, to the summons saluting your soul!  
Sending you forth to the quest of the world—  
Sending, that tyranny down may be hurled.

O, world's oppressed of every name—  
Mere pawns where monarchs play the game!  
Hark, how the masters are laughing at you—  
Laughing, that loafing and feasting, the few  
Live on your labor and lull you with lies—  
Promising plenty: suppressing your cries.

O, world's oppressed of every name,  
For all your ills, assume the blame!  
True, there are chains—and your children are slaves!  
True, you have title to nothing but graves!  
False—as their threats of a bottomless pit—  
*False*, that *enduring* you need here to sit.

O, world's oppressed of every name,  
Arise, arise, with souls aflame!  
See, there are centuries yet for the race!  
See, there is dawning the day of your grace!  
Dawning—and daring to deeds of the free—  
What shall the verdict of centuries be?

O, world's oppressed of every name,  
Behold! to you this message came:  
*Ask, and the world shall be given to you;*  
*Seek, and the world shall surrender the clue;*  
*Knock, and the nobles of earth shall obey.*  
KNOCK: oh, the knocking that heralds your day!  
*Edwin Arnold Brenholtz.*

# EDITORIAL

## The Farmer and Wageworker in the Socialist Party

A rather warm controversy is just now going on as to the functions which these two divisions of the producing classes are to play in the Socialist Party. In some respects it is largely a tempest in a tea pot and there is some reason to think that some of its features, at least, have been exaggerated because of its value to a few individuals.

Some rather ridiculous propositions have been put forward in relation to the immediate and future material interests of the farmer. It has been stated that the immediate interest of the farmer lies in the perpetuity of private property while the wageworker is immediately interested in its abolition. Another assertion which is coupled with this is that everybody follows their immediate interests. Whatever may be true of the first statement the second is certainly ridiculously untrue and at complete variance with the Socialist philosophy and particularly with the Marxian wing of Socialism and the doctrine of the class struggle. It is just because Socialists see that men can be made to sink their immediate personal and individual interests in their class interests that class-conscious action of the workers is possible. The momentary individual interest of the wageworker is the prosperity of his employer and the increase of the rate of production, since only under such conditions is there a possibility, though to be sure by no means a certainty, of better wages. This is the grain of truth in the "identity of interest" argument so glibly repeated by the labor fakir.

But the interest of the wageworker as a class lies in the abolition of the employing class and with it the entire wage system. Hence it is that we ask the individual to forego his immediate interest as an individual which might probably be better furthered by fawning on his employer, working overtime, and, in general, merging himself in the interests of his master, and instead to throw himself, with his class, into an effort to better the condition of all and ultimately abolish wage slavery.

When we turn to the farmer it is evident at once that the questions of immediate, individual and class interests are by no means as simple as with the wageworker. His exploitation and his social relations are much more complex. This is only one of many reasons why it will be difficult to win him for Socialism, and incidentally is a reason why there is never the remotest danger of his capturing the Socialist Party. His immediate individual interest consists in securing larger crops and higher prices, a matter which is to a large extent beyond his immediate control. Some comrades have claimed that his immediate interests lie in the reduction of railroad freights and the decentralization of trustified industry. A very slight knowledge of economics, especially of Socialist economists, would

have shown that these will afford the farmer no relief whatever. The competition between farmers with the vast extent of still uncultivated land, and the almost limitless possibility of increasing the productivity of that now cultivated makes it certain that the farmer would never receive any benefit from any change in railroad rates. Just how decentralization of industry would help him no one has, as yet, attempted to explain. That he has been fooled into believing he was interested in such measures is of no more importance than the fact that a majority of the workers believed that their interests were bound up in a full dinner pail or free silver at the last presidential election.

In considering the question of the farmer there are one or two facts which might as well be admitted. In the first place it is high time that Socialists who make any pretence to scientific accuracy, or even to the possession of common sense, should recognize the fact of the permanence of the small farm owner. We may juggle with figures and dream and theorize as much as we will, but the fact remains that neither concentration, nor tenantry, nor mortgages have as yet shown any sign of encroaching on the number of small farm owners. On the contrary, such owners have increased in numbers continuously and increased most rapidly where agriculture is most highly developed. The confusion on this point grows from the fact that with the immense number of new farms that are being added to the total number of farms, a large percentage are mortgaged or operated by tenants. But of the old farms there has as yet been no evidence of any decrease as to those owned and this is the whole point under discussion.

Now, the number of these small farm owners is sufficient when combined with those who are directly interested, both individually and as a class, in the capitalist method of exploitation to perpetuate that system—IF the interests of the farmers demand perpetuity, and political action is capable of checking economic development. These are two very large "ifs," however. Some comrades accept this philosophy which is largely that held by the opportunist school in Europe, without, however, being logical enough to accept the opportunist programme which such a philosophy demands.

Standing as we do on the materialistic interpretation of history and the doctrine of the class struggle as fundamental principles of our social philosophy, we do not believe that the opportunist or the utopian impossibilist position is a scientific one; that is to say, one which is in accord with facts.

Viewed in the light of the principles of scientific Socialism certain things seem evident to us. In the first place, the wage earners will always be the dominant element in any Socialist movement, or in any movement which has for its object the overthrow of capitalism. This will be not because of any silly rules as to membership which would raise occupation distinctions within the Socialist party and which are absolutely at variance with the whole international Socialist position and indicate a cowardly fear of elements which we do not feel able to meet in other ways. Wage workers will dominate in any such revolutionary movement because they are the distinctive product of capitalism and because their concentration in factories for work and in cities for dwelling makes possible the class-consciousness which cannot arise in more isolated groups of producers, and also because of the fact that they represent the more energetic and rebellious



portion of our present society. The migration from the country to the city is always of these elements, leaving the more conservative and less energetic behind. It will be recognized at once that the Western States present an exception to this latter proposition, although not to the others. The class struggle which Socialism recognizes is one between the exploiters and the exploited, the producers and the parasites. Since the wageworking proletariat constitutes the great essential dominating portion of the producing exploited class they must always constitute the dominating element in the Socialist movement. But this does not mean that we are not to welcome to our ranks any one who is willing to accept the Socialist position and throw in his destinies on the side of the producing exploited class in this class struggle. The way to keep our movement clear from capitalist influence is not to exclude certain members of the exploited class but to insist that all who come in accept the fact of the class struggle and its logical outcome. This, too, will be mainly secured not by any artificial restrictions on membership or any childish catechism or system of training, but by the widest freedom of discussion and dissemination of Socialist literature.

Unfortunately there are some very deplorable features of this present contest which, although superficial, tend to complicate it. It appears to us as if some individuals had taken advantage of the quarrel to enroll themselves as leaders upon one side or the other and to exaggerate the importance of the elements which they claim to represent. One phase of this has a specially familiar ring to those who went through the old fight within the Socialist Labor Party. It was the main stock in trade of the little politicians who clung with De Leon that they were the only clear-cut, class-conscious, etc., fellows. By constant reiteration they really succeeded in making some people believe that what they said was true, and that all who opposed them were muddled and confused. The same effort is being made at the present time by the same class within the Socialist Party. A little body of men, almost exclusively professional agitators, editors and party officials, are shrieking and screaming about the great danger to the wageworking movement. They are continually shouting about the need of clear economics, but unfortunately are themselves, in many cases, most ridiculously ignorant and confused. We have not the least hesitation in saying that we could find in the publication of this division and in the speeches which its members have made more examples of ignorance of primary Socialist truths and confusion as to Socialist doctrines than has appeared in almost any of the papers against which they are railing.

There is this to be said in favor of the comrades who are supposed to represent the farmer element, or the "new" element, or the "western" element, as it is sometimes called, that they at least have shown some willingness to learn, while their opponents seem to look upon themselves as having become endowed with the cloak of infallibility.

There is not the slightest doubt but what the Socialist Party has the greatest need of this class of small politicians and professional agitators. They are men who are generally willing to do much very necessary and rather disagreeable work for the sake of the little brief authority which they receive, but they are, of all men, the most unsafe from which to take counsel as to tactics. They are always afraid that their little machine will be upset. They instinctively realize their own smallness and are frightened lest the party grow too large for them to control. They constantly

lend themselves to intrigues and ring rule, and this with the very best of motives. Very few of them are now, or have been for some time past, wageworkers. While under ordinary circumstances it would be disreputable to raise this point, yet it cannot but be suggested when such a hue and cry is being raised about maintaining the control of the party by wage-workers. Furthermore, the attempted revival of the brag and bluster which we have so long associated with De Leonism is disgusting. This blowing about having whipped everything in sight by people whose marvelous abilities as gladiators has not been so pronounced as to justify any overwhelming admiration for their prowess, does not carry conviction. Too frequently we have witnessed the ignominious defeat of Socialist Labor Party men who had been filled with the sort of courage that proceeds from New York, and who had started out to annihilate some poor "kangaroo" in order to have the glory of writing it up for "The People."

At the same time we feel that there is undoubtedly some cause for complaint concerning some features of the Western movement. We feel that the attempt which has been made by some comrades to build up organizations alongside of the Socialist Party is something to be deprecated. It also tends to the creation of cliques and rings and to the creation of a "holier than thou" spirit which has no place in the Socialist movement. The place for the person who wishes to work for Socialism, and especially for the Socialist Party, is within the organization, and once within the organization, it is his duty to work in accord with it. This does not mean that he does not have the right to criticise it as severely as he wishes and to work for its alteration. But nothing is gained by encouraging outside organizations, or co-operating with elements outside the party, even if, in some cases, these elements may appear to him to be more nearly right than the party membership.

Just in closing it would be more convincing if some of the men who are raising so much of a fuss would give a few definite examples of the terrible tendency toward compromise which they claim exists. Who has proposed fusion, or the adoption of any tactics tainted with capitalism? It will not do to simply say that certain persons do not preach scientific socialist economics, because the writings and speeches of some of the accusers speak too eloquently of their inability to recognize such teachings if they heard them. Let us have something definite as to issues, and less of personalities and abstractions. Let us have less bluff, bluster, braggadocio and "buzz-saw" and more facts. We will assure them that the very moment that they point out any tendency within the Socialist Party to deviate from the position of clear-cut, class-conscious revolutionary Socialism (and these words are something more to us than canting phrases with which to conjure the ignorant) they will find us fighting as vigorously as any one against such tendencies. But we do not believe in this attempt to maintain a machine and scare off all criticism by throwing up a mass of mud and indulging in wholesale abuse.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

By Max S. Hayes.

"Hell's broke loose in Texas!" is the somewhat startling saying that has become more or less popularized in the Southwest, and it expresses the present situation correctly so far as organized labor is concerned. Readers of the REVIEW will recall that mention was made in this department several months ago that the Texas legislature had enacted an anti-trust law under the provisions of which trade unions could be attacked in the courts. The Texas unionists attempted to have the law changed, but were unsuccessful, and the attorney-general wrote to President Gompers, of the A. F. of L., in reply to an inquiry, that there was no cause for alarm, as the law would not be enforced against the unions. But what is the result? Were the criminal trusts proceeded against? Not a single capitalistic combine was driven from the state. On the contrary, Attorney-General Bell, who possesses a treacherous memory, and District Attorney Bee have begun proceedings against the Electrical Workers' Union of San Antonio for \$6,000 damages for boycotting, and for an additional \$50 a day for every day that the boycott is continued, and the anti-trust law is the weapon that is being used against the unionists. These Bourbon hypocrites never intended to smash the trusts. If the truth were known it would probably demonstrate the fact that the anti-trust law was enacted for blackmailing purposes, to furnish boodle for corrupt politicians. The unions, having no boodle to feed the hungry grafters, will be bled in another way. In addition to this case, as well as the damage suits reported in the last couple of numbers of the REVIEW, several more can be mentioned. There seems to be a regular craze in Chicago to mulct the unions. Another suit has been commenced in that city and the sheet metal workers are in this one. An independent contractor charges that the bosses' association and the union conspired to drive him out of business, and he wants both sides to soothe his wounded feelings with \$100,000. Still another case has been begun by the Bourbon bosses in Richmond, Va., who want \$10,000 from the stone masons for refusing to work on boycotted material. So the new scheme to disrupt unions and confiscate their treasuries is spreading to every section of the country, and Democratic and Republican politicians are doing nothing to hamper Democratic and Republican capitalists from injuring organized labor. All the same, the rank and file are rapidly learning that there is a class struggle, and they will strike back at the polls through the Socialist party, no matter what the views of a few back-number leaders, so-called, may be.

It is well that the Socialist Party has taken a firm stand on the so-called negro question, and that Eugene V. Debs, G. A. Hoehn, A. M. Simons and other writers and speakers have delivered some sledge-hammer blows through the REVIEW and other party publications along this line.

There is no doubt that a surreptitious attempt is being made to make an "issue" out of the unfortunate race hatred that is being engendered in different parts of the country, just as the politicians have played the North against the South and the Protestants against the Catholics in the past to obscure the economic problems that pressed for solution. Tariff, imperialism and finance are dead issues, and the bosses are aiming to stave off a discussion of the dangerous trust question by arraying the black and white laboring people against each other. This view is clearly substantiated by the action at Yale, the institution presided over by the scab-loving Hadley, where the Townsend prize was awarded in the law school to George William Crawford, a young colored man of Birmingham, Ala. His address was entitled "Trades Unionism and Patriotism," and the portion that won the ecomiums of plutocracy and quite likely the prize was clothed in these words: "The vicious syllogism that labor creates wealth and wealth belongs to those who create it and doctrines which flow from it have been universally adopted by the workingmen and the trades union as the means by which they hope to regain their loss. The union reduces all to a common level; makes worthy support unworthy; prevents honest citizens from serving their country; disregards rights of individuals and of the community, and finally stands for lawlessness and disorder. No completer indictment could be made against the patriotism of trades unionism than proof of these facts. And for this proof we have but to turn to the events of a single year. Let organized labor seek vindication in the forum of reason; let it seek redress by just and lawful means, remembering that it always has that ultimate court of appeal—the conscience of a great people, a great country of equity, where legal forms and fictions avail not against justice." Without attempting to reply to the peculiar philosophy contained in the foregoing, which can be riddled by any novice in social science, there is reason to suspicion that the Yale plutocrats passed the prize to Crawford for two reasons: First, to give public expression of their contempt for labor, and, secondly, with the expectation that it would intensify the hatred of one race against the other. But these conspirators will find that their transparent schemes will be perforated. The Socialists and trade union spokesmen are as keen as they; and capitalism's new "issue" will be battered into smithereens by the class-conscious workers of America.

There is a well-founded belief that, despite the "prosperity" bluster of editorial writers, the big capitalists are preparing for another period of industrial depression. Western newspapers have been printing stories in their news columns that large speculators and trusts are now preparing to force a panic to cause a depression that will throw many industries into idleness, and thus, while they gobble up the stocks at a low price, will also break up the labor unions, the latter being the principal object of the move. They hope to kill two birds with one stone. Henry Clews, "Divine" Baer, Senator Hanna, the New York Board of Trade and a whole brood of daily papers, headed by the New York Sun, have been telling us for some time that unless organized labor ceases to make "unreasonable demands," that discourage investment and cut down profits, "capital is likely to take a holiday." Whether an industrial panic comes this year or next, and whether the conspirators succeed in putting a stop to the unprecedented work of organizing unions, the fact remains that the big capitalistic sponge which has been inflated by the formation of trusts is being squeezed, and hun-



dreds and thousands of small-fry, get-rich-quick capitalists, who invested the pennies that they fleeced from labor for wind and water, are being beautifully shorn. They purchased common stock and the market has been hammered down to a point that means a billion-dollar loss for the little fellows, who are now enabled to frame their certificates and hang them in the cellar and dream of the days when they were trust magnates (?). Old Russell Sage declares that Rockefeller and Morgan "do not make money out of each other." They add to their pile no matter what the condition of the market is. As unionists we are wasting no sympathy on the bankrupts and weaklings. What's bothering us is, are our dear old employers, the manufacturers and merchants, mixed up in the financial ledgermain on Wall street, and are they likely to have their working capital confiscated by the big fellows? If so, they may try to cover their losses by beating down wages or close their shops and throw labor out of work. That would mean a slacking of union activity. These are some of the fruits of the capitalistic system wherein many workingmen believe they cannot live without a master, like the negro slaves once did.

Despite all obstacles the American Federation of Labor is making tremendous progress, and probably by the time the Boston convention assembles the organization will have in excess of 2,000,000 members. At the present time the A. F. of L. has 1,050 commissioned organizers in the field, and from the reports being received all of them are being kept busy. There were 2,542 organizations affiliated with the Federation on May 1, and 107 of that number are national and international unions, with from ten to 1,500 local unions each. It shows the immense growth of the trades union movement in this country, and it is not stretching the situation a particle by estimating that, counting the unattached nationals, the railway brotherhoods and the Western unionists, there are fully 2,500,000 organized men and women in the country.

Mayor Sullivan, of Hartford, Conn., who was elected by a local Union Labor party, is in hot water. Mr. Sullivan is quoted as saying that the "walking delegate" should be abolished, because he is entrusted with too much power; because he is tempted to abuse the trust put in him, and his interest is in fomenting trouble and not in preventing it, and because he is too expensive. This is precisely the position that is taken by the bosses' combines, and the mayor is being denounced in strong terms by union people in his neighborhood. Trades unions have as much right to employ a business agent as a corporation has to hire a manager, and Mayor Sullivan's statement shows that the working people of Hartford were buncoed when they elected him, as he seems to be a workingman with a capitalist mind.

When all else failed the Philadelphia striking textile workers attempted to get the "best citizens," who recently held a Kishineff protest meeting, to call another meeting to denounce the textile manufacturers, but the first citizens refuse to "indignate." Then the workers sent for Debs, for which they were roundly scolded by the leader of the employers' combine, one Alexander Crow, beneficiary of a protective tariff, Republican boss, mill owner and child slave driver. The textile workers, mostly women and children, have made a magnificent fight for a 54-hour week and humane treatment, and they were ably assisted by Mother Jones, John Spargo, Isaac

Cowen, Edward Moore, Mahlon Barnes, Caroline Pemberton and other well-known Socialists who collected funds for them and encouraged them by making speeches at their mass meetings. Mother Jones also aroused considerable interest by marching a small army of strikers to New York and the seashore. Speeches were made and funds collected along the route.

The strike insurance scheme of the National Association of Manufacturers is assuming tangible shape. In accordance with the resolution adopted at the New Orleans convention of that body recently, the executive committee held a session in Indianapolis and formulated a plan to create a fund of \$1,500,000 for the purpose of assisting members who resist the "tyranny" of organized labor. The proposition is to be submitted to a vote of the membership and if it is approved work will be commenced to accumulate the fund. In order to throw dust in the eyes of the public it is specifically mentioned that employers who declare lockouts will not secure aid from the N. A. M., but care was taken to say nothing about actions of bosses who force lockouts by making conditions unbearable for employes and who are thus compelled to go on strike. It is also reported that the name and by-laws of the Parry organization will be changed to National Association of Manufacturers and Employers in order that all classes of capitalists can be admitted. A convention of employers' associations that are independent of the N. A. of M. is to be held in Chicago for the purpose of perfecting a federation along the lines of the A. F. of L., and it is probable that the N. A. of M. will form the nucleus of the new body. The latter association has riding delegates in the field forming local branches, and from the Pacific coast and the Southwest, as well as the East and Middle West, come reports almost daily of new associations that are being perfected by the capitalists to combat "the evils in trade unions." Hardly a national convention is held by employers already organized that is not visited by Parry in person or one of his satellites to gain its affiliation, and a string of daily newspapers from New York to Los Angeles and New Orleans boom the capitalistic organizations early and late. The auxiliaries of the employers' associations, the "independent" or "non-union" unions are also being encouraged and assisted in the industrial centers, and a convention is to be held to form a national organization. While many officials of trade unions may consider it good policy to ridicule the formation of these bosses' combines, they may as well make up their minds that such tactics will not check their growth and expansion one iota. The employers' associations are here to remain, and the best manner in which to deal with them is to put forth renewed efforts to organize the workers into unions and into the Socialist Party as well in order that we may meet them upon an equal footing. If they have economic power, we must have the same; if they have political power, we must have the same. They have such power and it is in order for us to keep busy and vote as we organize and strike, for labor.

The anthracite miners complain that they were buncoed because of the award of Dr. Charles P. Neill, the statistical commissioner, who was appointed by Judge Gray to compile data regarding coal prices. The strike commission had decided that when the average price of coal in New York shall go above \$4.50 a ton the miners shall receive 1 per cent increase in wages for each full 5 cents advance. The miners knowing that the coal

companies were adding 10 cents per month to the price of coal beginning with May, argued that an advance of 20 cents per ton entitled them to a 4 per cent increase in wages. But along came Dr. Neill, and, by some clever now-you-see-it-and-now-you-don't averaging, showed the miners that instead of the 4 per cent advance the miners were anticipating they would only get 1 per cent. And then "Divine Rights" Baer and his brother barons laughed again. They had a second spasm of hilarity when they passed a financial statement among themselves on the first of June. It will be recalled that last November the Reading road reported a deficit of nearly \$2,000,000 for the period of July, August, September and October, the strike months, and compared to the same period the year previous the loss was \$3,500,000. At the end of May this year the Reading reports a surplus of over four and a quarter millions. In other words, the Baer crowd is over three-quarters of a million dollars ahead of the game, and from now on will be in clover because the profits, on account of the high price of coal, will be greater than before the strike. But the "divine" gentlemen are not yet satiated. Baer is quoted as saying that the coal combine will accumulate a surplus of 10,000,000 tons of anthracite and store the same in anticipation of another strike. Prices will also be maintained despite "the law of supply and demand." The people like to pay the freight, and quite likely after the Presidential election next year the miners will be given another battle by Bro. Capital. Of course, so long as the miners and the great majority of other workers believe that the mines and railways belong to a privileged few, the rest of us will have to stand it. But the issue, Shall the people own the trusts or shall the trusts own the people? is here just the same and must and will be fought out.

It would require many pages of the *REVIEW* to relate in detail the extraordinary activity and rapid growth of the Socialist Party. The immense victory in Germany seems to have electrified the whole United States, and organizers and speakers are busy in every state. The party press and friendly trade union papers are also doing great work and report the progress that is being made from week to week very faithfully. Probably the statement of National Committeeman Berger, of Wisconsin, covers the situation in a few words. Mr. Berger attended the last meeting of the local qucrum in Omaha, and reports that during the last quarter (April, May, June) the Socialist Party membership increased by six thousand, and he prophesies that if this rate of gain is kept up the Socialists in this country will outnumber those in Germany before four years.

# SOCIALISM ABROAD

## Germany

The articles which appear elsewhere in this number cover the various phases of the German election so thoroughly that there is need of little more in this department. The official return as published in Vorwaerts gives a total vote in the empire of 3,008,377, against a previous vote of 2,107,076. The vote in various provinces compared with the previous election is given as follows:

Province.	1903.	Previous Election.
Prussia .....	1,647,603	1,141,958
Bavaria .....	212,506	138,218
Saxony .....	441,764	299,190
Wurtemberg .....	99,743	62,452
Baden .....	72,300	50,325
Hesse .....	68,834	48,942
Alsace Loraine .....	68,267	51,990

Owing to the outrageous gerrymandering this great preponderance of Social Democratic strength is not shown in the Reichstag. Nevertheless there have been great changes in the interest of the Social Democracy in spite of this gerrymandering.

As to the probable effects of the election there is considerable disagreement. One phase of this is discussed by Comrade Untermann in this number. The question of what the Emperor will do is one which is arousing considerable interest. Many of the conservative papers urge the abolition of universal suffrage and some even go so far as to demand a coup d'etat and the establishment of a military autocracy.

	Definitely Elected	Previous Strength.	Gain or Loss.
Conservative .....	53	52	+ 1
Deutsche Reichspartei .....	19	20	- 1
Antisemiten .....	9	12	- 3
Centrum .....	101	106	- 5
Nationalliberale .....	52	53	- 1
Freisinnige Volkspartei .....	21	28	- 7
Freisinnige Vereinigung .....	9	15	- 6
Deutsche Volkspartei .....	6	7	- 1
Socialdemokraten .....	81	58	+23
Bund der Landwirte .....	2	6	- 4
Bahrischer Bauernbund .....	5	5	0
Polen .....	16	14	+ 2
Melsen .....	5	3	+ 2
Elsasser .....	9	10	- 1
Miscellaneous .....	9	8	+ 1



The last returns given by Vorwaerts as to the principal other parties are as follows: Center, 1,455,100; National Liberal, 1,290,000; Conservative, 920,000. These figures are not official and probably contain considerable errors.

The last quarterly report on the Socialist press gives 51 dailies in addition to Vorwaerts, one scientific weekly; *Die Nieu Zeit*; nine papers appearing three times, and three papers appearing twice a week; six weeklies, two semi-monthlies and two monthlies. In addition, there are two comic papers, and two illustrated papers dealing more with general literature. The same report shows that there are 65 periodicals issued by the unions affiliated with the Socialists.

## The Spanish Elections

Spain is not yet ripe for an important socialist movement. In the first place the economic development is wanting. There are a few large cities of modern industry where there is something of a movement. The laborers in the country, the mines and the harbors are almost all illiterate and the educated industrial laborers are too remote from the mass of wretched proletarians, so that the elements for realizing a class-conscious labor movement are lacking.

Poverty excites revolutionary currents among this population, but the complete absence of class-consciousness turns these revolutionary ideas into a sort of anarchism decidedly brutal and not at all practical, which can only serve to make the ruling class feel the need of a more and more tyrannical government and prevent it from establishing social reforms which the quasi-revolutionary working class would have none of.

Nevertheless the Social Democrats in certain cities exercise more or less influence. At Madrid, Bilbao and some other places their influence is stronger than that of the anarchists over the working class, but at Barcelona, and still more in some other large cities the contrary seems true. To concern itself with politics the working class has need of a certain degree of consciousness and a certain need of development which is lacking to the Spanish proletariat. It is partly owing to these circumstances that Spanish Social Democracy plays no great role as yet in the politics of the country; but there are other reasons still. The republican movement in Spain has made great progress during these last years. That is the result of the war with America. In Spain the monarchy and the church are one and the same. The king is called his Catholic Majesty; the clergy reigns as a master.

After the war there arrived from Cuba, Porto Rico, and especially the Philippines, an army of monks and nuns who distributed themselves all over Spain and set immediately to work. They have millions of money at their disposal. The religious congregations are established on a large scale industrially. This capitalist power of the clergy, disastrous for the people, on the one side, and the anti-clerical sentiments of the young bourgeoisie along with the revolutionary spirit of the working class on the other side, have given a new strength to the republican current. It is worth observation that according to the law there can be no convents in Spain. Indeed in 1841 a law was established suppressing the convents, but that does not prevent the fact that at present forty-one orders may be counted, including about 60,000 monks and nuns.

The legislative party in Spain is composed, first, of a senate, containing 360 members; half of these are appointed for life by the king; second, of the cortes (chamber of deputies) formed of 443 deputies elected by universal suffrage. Since 1890 every man 25 years and upwards has the right to vote for the Cortes. The deputies have no salary. But in view of the fact that the election tickets have to be filled in by hand and that no one in the country knows how to read or write, it follows that it is the alcade appointed by the government who is the general elector for the whole village. Now the alcade thinks as does the curate. In Spain the elections never have any other result than that desired by the government, which prescribes to the alcades what they have to do, and they lead the rural populations. In the cities where the republican movement exists this is becoming less and less true.

The results of the elections should not be judged by the number of seats obtained by the government; this signifies nothing. We must consider the centers of national life where men are united, have some education and live under the influence of modern civilization.

At Madrid the republicans obtained six seats out of eight; the monarchists had only 12,000 votes. At Barcelona the republicans obtained 35,000, the liberalists 10,000, and the Carlists 6,000. At Gerone and Saragossa the republicans were elected; at Corunna and Cadiz they also took part in the elections.

The socialists have registered few votes; we have explained the reasons for this, and the fact is of no great importance. The working class must, before it can acquire class-consciousness, first overcome reaction, and to that end it is first necessary to overthrow the monarchy. The growth of the republican movement is a good sign for Spain.—*L'Avenir Social*.

## France

The Central Council of the Parti Ouvrier Francais has just issued its report preliminary to the congress which will meet on the 27th and 29th of September. This shows that in the last three months three new federations have been formed and the weekly central organ *Le Socialiste* has shown a financial surplus for the last nine months. The report shows that the Jauresist faction is in process of dissolution, that a number of bodies affiliated with it are protesting against the policy of its representatives and are preparing to leave the organization.

## Holland

General municipal elections were held on the 10th of July. For the first time there was a general coalition of all of the capitalist parties against the socialists. This was especially true in Amsterdam where the campaign cry was "Down with the Social Democracy." As a result all of the Social Democratic candidates were defeated although the vote was raised from 5,680 to 7,493.

## Japan

Some items from the latest number of the *Socialist* of Japan which has just come to hand show the difficulties which are confronted by the workers for socialism in that country. Because this paper published a poem entitled "International Liberty," which was taken from the Cleveland *Citi-*

zen of June 17th, the paper was at once confiscated and Comrade Katayama indicted. Under these conditions the following items which are taken from the same number gain a double interest:

"The freedom of press and speech is guaranteed by the Imperial constitution to all the citizens of Japan, but now-a-days both are hindered by that obnoxious police regulation and the press law. Every labor meeting is interfered by the policemen present; and the press is so severely censored, and even common expressions pertaining to labor organization and strike are instantly stopped by the police now for the laboring classes and their leaders. Socialist meetings are so much troubled by constant stoppages and in some cases a dissolution of the meeting."

"Socialist agitation will be started by Messrs. Nishikawa, Matsuzaki and Katayama leaving the city for Kobe on the fifth, provided that the verdict in the case referred to will not be the imprisonment of the last named member. In that case, of course, two of them will constitute the party."

## Denmark

On June 16th, the same day on which the great socialist victories were won in Germany, an almost equally great advance was made in Denmark. This is especially worthy of note because of the fact that for the first time all alliances with the Liberals were rejected and the socialist party stood entirely independent. It was feared by many that the taking of this step would mean at least a temporary loss of many votes. The fact that the contrary was the result is gratifying from every point of view.

In the last parliament there were 14 Social Democrats. Thirteen of our 14 districts we carried again on June 16, losing only that of Lungby. On the other hand, we carried three new districts—the Seventh, of Copenhagen, Valby, and the first of Odensee. In the Seventh Copenhagen district our comrade, C. A. Smidt, defeated the reactionary Finance Minister Hage. We now hold eight of the 13 districts of the national capital, besides one in Friedrichberg, one in Odensee, and those of Valby, Helsingor, Aalborg, Aarhus North, Aarhus South and Horsens. The new lagthing is composed of 16 Social Democrats, 74 Left Reformists, 11 of the Moderate Left and 12 of the Right.

In the election of 1872 our party entered the field for the first time, polling 268 votes. In 1876 this was increased to 1,076. In 1881 it rose to 1,689. Then began a more rapid and progressive increase, as indicated in the following table, which shows also the number of districts in which we had candidates at each election:

Year.	Districts.	Vote.
1884 .....	3	6,806
1887 .....	4	8,408
1890 .....	10	17,232
1892 .....	15	20,004
1895 .....	17	24,508
1898 .....	23	31,872
1901 .....	30	42,972
1903 .....	55	55,479

The total vote by parties this year is as follows: Reformists, 118,957; Social Democrats, 55,479; Right (Conservative), 50,559; Moderates, 20,613. We have thus about 23 per cent of the popular vote and rank as the second party.

## BOOK REVIEWS

Heredity and Social Progress. Simon N. Patten. New York: The Macmillan Company. 214 pp. Cloth, \$1.25.

Professor Patten sets before himself the answering of the following definite questions:

"How is the social surplus of an epoch transformed into permanent conditions and mental traits?"

"Does progress start from a deficit, or from a surplus?"

"Does genius come by additions, or by differentiation?"

"Does education improve natural or acquired characters?"

"Does reform come by strengthening the strong, or by helping the weak?"

He agrees with Professor Lester F. Ward that the surplus can only be secured by transformation into permanent conditions, or into mental traits. He closely follows biological analogies and takes great pains to test the laws of development which he uses by applying them in various fields. He decides against the inheritance of acquired characteristics by the individuals and points out that such characteristics are largely handed down through customs, habits and local traditions which make it easier for each succeeding generation to acquire the desired character. On this point he makes use of John Fiske's theory of the desirability of a long childhood by showing that this gives opportunity for the attainment of socially desirable acquired characteristics. He shows that once a surplus energy has expressed itself in some desirable addition to character that there will be a tendency on the part of the possessor to move into localities more favorable to this characteristic. Or as he says: "Personal environments do not make the qualities of those who live in them. But people seek these environments because they have the characteristics necessary to their utilization."

He has much very suggestive discussion of psychological problems and especially in relation to physiological states and the effect of these states on the physical structure of their possessor. This, however, is so extremely condensed that any attempt to summarize it would simply give a misleading idea. Many of his positions seem to lack proof and are so daring as to cause doubt as to their correctness. Nevertheless it is gratifying to find a man who dares to push his ideas to their logical conclusions, even if the conclusions be somewhat doubtful, and at the least the treatment is extremely stimulating and suggestive.

In his later chapters he applies his theories to education and reform and comes to this conclusion: "Education cannot improve on natural characters. Progress is the development of the strong, not where they are strong, but where they are weak. The strength of the strong character is the result of a natural differentiation with which men have little to do,



but the strength of weak characters is in their hands. Men can level up their weaknesses until their whole character is strong."

In the social field the application of the same principles leads to analogous conclusions:

"Progress then is not the making of the strong, but that protection of the weak by which differentiation becomes possible. A forward movement can care for itself if the initial conditions are favorable, and human efforts are of little avail in augmenting or in changing the direction of these forces. With the aid of their strong characters men may move forward as far as the initial economic forces take them. But these forces will not aid men on their weak sides, because natural changes make individual weaknesses feebler instead of stronger. The series of steps making for progress, although almost complete, lacks enough elements to block progress, when no efforts are made to strengthen the dwarfed characters in men. And strengthening the weak is not a final process, but one which must be repeated by each generation with ever increasing care. The strength of the strong is natural, that of the weak is acquired. The differentiation of powers is the outcome of natural processes; the movement towards equality must be nurtured. The exploitation of the weak by the strong and the dwarfing of feeble characters by the strong are natural results of the pressure exerted by the strong. A check to progress here arises for which there is no natural remedy. When, therefore, nations wish to progress, it is these tendencies which nullify their efforts.

"A backward race or class need not be radically altered to fit it for civilization. Most of the changes come of themselves if the initial evils are removed. Give the class or the dwarfed character a surplus, and spontaneous changes will reorganize society. The initial step in progress is protection, and a flow of income from the strong to the weak.

"An illustration is furnished by the changes in the immigrants to America. A few generations make them completely American not because the conscious educational process has had sufficient power to do it, but because a few initial changes start a chain of natural causes which strengthen the strong individuals of the new classes and force their transformation into Americans. Two things are necessary for this; the presence of a growth-creating surplus and the existence of common emotions, so that men's qualities may be uniformly pruned, and may also grow anew in the same directions. The emotions of a race are not a natural inheritance due to growth, but are a part of the social environment of its members, and act alike on all individuals under the stress of the emotions. Regeneration results wherever the surplus permits growth and places the person in proper contact with his environment. Society, therefore, may expect these emotional changes to act upon every class which has gained the surplus on which growth and regeneration depend. It must guard, not these natural results of every forward movement, but the acquired characters which become weaker with progress, and require an increasing surplus in order to preserve the natural equality of classes and of related parts.

"The development of a lower race—let us say the negroes in America—does not necessitate remaking the negro by an artificial process. Set free the series of natural changes, and the final results will take care of themselves. A surplus includes regeneration and new emotions, forces which will act and react until the whole class has been brought up to the level

of its environment. Two races in one environment cannot be kept apart except by some exploitation that harms the weaker one of them. The amplest protection and a surplus-yielding discipline will stimulate the forces in a lower class which will ultimately raise them to the level of the highest. Each discipline yields a new surplus which offers emotion and regeneration a fresh opportunity to evoke natural qualities. The more freely we give to the weak, the more is gained by the strong."

The Socialist will at once see in this a support for his position that race progress will be furthered by the economic equality of a co-operative society. The following quotation is particularly appropriate in relation to the question of whether Socialism will tend to dwarf genius: "If then men work for genius and neglect equality, they get neither; but if they work for equality, they gain both genius and equality."

There is another sentence which is specially interesting in view of the discussion of the effect of ideas on economic progress. As is generally known, Professor Patten accepts the materialistic conception of history, and this is how he answers the argument that ideas also react: After economic epochs cease to exist, they live in the mental life they have created. Character, in the sense of inherited traits, has its curve of thought with as strong and clear an outline as that which marks the stress of economic conditions.

No one wants to undertake the reading of this work of Professor Patten's without he is willing to give it considerable hard study, for it is intensely compact in thought and rather more abstract in style than seems necessary. Nevertheless for those who are willing to do some good, thorough work it is well worth their attention.

Prince Hagen, a Phantasy. By Upton Sinclair. L. C. Page & Co. Cloth, pp 249. \$1.00.

Although cast in a lighter vein, we cannot but feel that this is the best thing this writer has so far done. The plot is distinctly unique. It is the story of a Nibelung who was sent up to earth. The Nibelungs "are represented to us as creatures not immoral, but unmoral; as having no other ideal than the getting of gold, and therefore having no other duty, spending the whole of their lives in the effort, and being, both in their joys and their sorrows, very funny little men indeed. "I dwelt upon that idea for some time," says the author, "and likewise upon another which it had often brought to my mind: the wonder whether this huge, overgrown civilization of ours, this vast machine-built jungle, where bigness is so much taken for greatness, and greediness for power,—whether it were not perhaps but another Nibelheim, without the excuse of darkness." In the midst of these reveries he is introduced into Nibelheim and brings back with him Prince Hagen, the son of old King Alberic, and it is the adventures of this Prince, who has all the cold "unmoral" avaricious characteristics of the Nibelungs with the human attribute of ambition. His career in politics, society and business is but an exemplification of some premises in our society pushed to their logical conclusion. He starts out in his political career with Tammany, but Alberic happening to die at a very fortuitous moment he finds himself with unlimited wealth at his disposal and turns Republican. He is well on the way to be the ruler of the universe when an unfortunate runaway terminates his life. The author does not tell us what became of the estate. Perhaps "that is another story."

# Charles H. Kerr & Company's Publications

## SOCIALIST BOOKS IN CLOTH BINDING.

ALLMAN—God's Children: A Modern Allegory. By James Allman....	\$.50
AVELING—The Student's Marx: An Introduction to the Study of Karl Marx's Capital. By Edward Aveling, D. Sc.....	1.00
BADEN-POWELL—The Origin and Growth of Village Communities In India. By B. H. Baden-Powell, M. A., C. I. E.....	1.00
BAX—The Religion of Socialism: Being Essays in Modern Socialist Criticism. By Ernest Belfort Bax.....	1.00
BAX—The Ethics of Socialism: Being Further Essays in Modern Socialist Criticism, etc. By Ernest Belfort Bax.....	1.00
BAX—Outlooks from the New Standpoint. By E. Belfort Bax.....	1.00
BAX—The Story of the French Revolution. By E. Belfort Bax.....	1.00
BERNSTEIN—Ferdinand Lassalle as a Social Reformer. By Edward Bernstein .....	1.00
BLATCHFORD—Britain for the British (America for the Americans). By Robert Blatchford.....	.50
BROOME—The Last Days of the Ruskin Co-operative Association. By Isaac Broome .....	.50
CARPENTER—England's Ideal, and Other Papers on Social Subjects. By Edward Carpenter.....	1.00
CARPENTER—Civilization, Its Cause and Cure, and Other Essays. By Edward Carpenter .....	1.00
CARPENTER—Love's Coming-of-Age. By Edward Carpenter.....	1.00
DAGUE—Henry Ashton: A Socialist Novel. By R. A. Dague.....	.75
DAWSON—Bismarck and State Socialism: An Exposition of the Social and Economic Legislation of Germany Since 1870. By William Harbutt Dawson .....	1.00
DAWSON—German Socialism and Ferdinand Lasalle. By William Harbutt Dawson .....	1.00
ENGELS—The Condition of the Working-Class In England In 1844. With Preface written in 1892. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Florence Kelley Wischniewtzky.....	1.25
ENGELS—Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Austin Lewis.....	.50
ENGELS—The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Ernest Untermann.....	.50
ENGELS—Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Edward Aveling, D. Sc.....	.50
HINDS—American Communities: Revised Edition. Enlarged to Include Additional Societies, New and Old, Communistic, Semi-Communistic and Co-operative. By William Alfred Hinds, Ph. B. ....	1.00
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW—Volume I, 1900-1901.....	2.00
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW—Volume II, 1901-1902.....	2.00
INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW—Volume III, 1902-1903.....	2.00
KAUTSKY—The Social Revolution. By Karl Kautsky. Translated by A. M. and May Wood Simons.....	.50
LAFARGUE—The Evolution of Property from Savagery to Civilization. By Paul Lafargue.....	1.00
LIEBKNECHT—Karl Marx: Biographical Memoirs. Translated by Ernest Untermann .....	.50
LORIA—The Economic Foundations of Society. By Achille Loria.....	1.25
MARX—Capital: A Critical Analysis of Capitalist Production. By Karl Marx. Translated from the Third German Edition by Samuel Moore and Edward Aveling, and Edited by Frederick Engels....	2.00



MARX—Revolution and Counter-Revolution; or, Germany In 1848. By Karl Marx .....	1.00
MARX and ENGELS—Manifesto of the Communist Party. By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.....	.50
MASSART and VANDERVELDE—Parasitism, Organic and Social. By Jean Massart and Emile Vandervelde.....	1.00
MAYNARD—Walt Whitman: The Poet of the Wider Selfhood. By Mila Tupper Maynard.....	1.00
MORMAN—The Principles of Social Progress. A Study of Civilization. By James Bale Morman, A. B.....	.50
MORRIS and BAX—Socialism, Its Growth and Outcome. By William Morris and Ernest Belfort Bax.....	1.25
PERSINGER—Letters from New America; or, An Attempt at Practical Socialism. By Clark Edmund Persinger.....	.50
ROBERTS—The Pure Causeway. By Evelyn Harvey Roberts.....	1.00
RODBERTUS—Overproduction and Crises. By Karl Rodbertus.....	1.00
ROGERS—Work and Wages. By James E. Thorold Rogers, M. P.....	1.00
SCHAEFFLE—The Quintessence of Socialism. By Dr. A. Schaeffle....	1.00
SIMONS—The American Farmer. By A. M. Simons.....	.50
SOMBART—Socialism and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century. By Prof. Werner Sombart.....	1.00
VANDERVELDE—Collectivism and Industrial Evolution. By Emile Vandervelde. Translated by Charles H. Kerr.....	.50

#### MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS IN CLOTH BINDING.

ALTGELD—Oratory, Its Requirements and Its Rewards. By John P. Altgeld .....	\$ .50
BECH-MEYER—A Story from Pullmantown. By Nico Bech-Meyer....	.50
BENNETT—A Breed of Barren Metal; or, Currency and Interest. By J. W. Bennett.....	.75
BROWN—Parasitic Wealth; or, Money Reform. By John Brown.....	1.00
CHASE—Elementary Principles of Economics. By Charles H. Chase..	1.25
COLSON—The Story of a Dream. By Ethel Maude Colson.....	1.00
DARROW—Resist Not Evil. By Clarence S. Darrow.....	.75
DEL MAR—A History of Monetary Systems. By Alexander Del Mar...	2.00
FEARING—Roberta, a Novel. By Blanche Fearing.....	1.00
FLINT—On the Road to the Lake, a Novel. By Sam Flint.....	1.00
GENONE—The Last Tenet Imposed Upon the Khan of Thomatoz. By Hudor Genone .....	1.00
HANCOCK—John Auburntop, Novelist. By Anson Uriel Hancock.....	1.00
HANSEN—The Legend of Hamlet. By George P. Hansen.....	.50
HILL—Money Found: An Outline of a Plan for Government Banking. By Thomas E. Hill.....	.75
HULING—The Courage of Her Convictions. By Caroline A. Huling....	1.00
JOHNSON—Theodore Parker, a Lecture. By Samuel Johnson.....	1.00
KJELLAND—Elsie, a Christmas Story. By Alexander Kjelland.....	.50
LEWIS—A History of the American Tariff. By Eugene C. Lewis.....	.75
MARSHALL—Launching and Landing (Poems). By Perry Marshall..	1.00
MARTIN—The Social Status of European and American Women. By Kate Byam Martin and Ellen M. Henrotin.....	.50
MATTHEW—The Gospel of Matthew in Greek, with Vocabulary. Edited by Alexander Kerr and Herbert Cushing Tolman.....	1.00
MILLS—Evolutionary Politics. By Walter Thomas Mills.....	1.00
ODELL—The Last War: A Story of the 26th Century. By S. M. Odell..	.50
PLUMMER—Gracia, a Social Tragedy. By Frank Everett Plummer..	1.25
RICHARDS—Ahead of the Hounds. By Lydia Platt Richards.....	1.00
SULLIVAN—So the World Goes. Twenty Stories. By J. W. Sullivan..	.75
TABER—Suggestion the Secret of Sex. By C. Wilbur Taber.....	1.00
WILLIAMS—Rational Theology. By John Milton Williams, D. D.....	1.25



## SOCIALIST BOOKS IN PAPER COVERS.

(For Others, See List Headed "Pocket Library of Socialism.")

ALLEN—A Study of Government. By Henry F. Allen.....	\$ .05
BLATCHFORD—Britain for the British. By Robert Blatchford.....	.25
BLATCHFORD—Merrie England. By Robert Blatchford.....	.10
BLISS—Plutocracy's Statistics. By H. L. Bliss.....	.10
BOUROFF—The Impending Crisis: Conditions Resulting from the Con- centration of Wealth in the United States. By Basil Bouroff....	.35
DARROW—Crime and Criminals. By Clarence S. Darrow.....	.10
ENGELS—Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. By Frederick Engels. Translated by Edward Aveling, D. Sc.....	.10
KAUTSKY—Frederick Engels: His Life, His Work and His Writings. Translated by May Wood Simons.....	.10
KERR—Socialist Songs with Music. Compiled by Charles H. Kerr....	.20
LAFARGUE—Socialism and the Intellectuals. By Paul Lafargue. Trans- lated by Charles H. Kerr.....	.05
LIEBKNECHT—Socialism, What It Is and What It Seeks to Accomplish. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Translated by May Wood Simons.....	.10
LIEBKNECHT—No Compromise: No Political Trading. By Wilhelm Liebknecht. Translated by A. M. Simons and Marcus Hitch.....	.10
MARX and ENGELS—Manifesto of the Communist Party. By Karl Marx and Frederick Engels.....	.10
MACHINIST—Capital and Labor. By a Black-Listed Machinist.....	.25
NEWSPAPER MAN—Man or Dollar, Which? A Novel.....	.25
PERSINGER—Letters From New America. By Clark Edmund Persinger.....	.25
PLATO—The Republic of Plato. Translated by Alexander Kerr. Books I, II and III now ready, others in preparation. Price of each book	.15
ROBERTS—The Pure Causeway. By Evelyn Harvey Roberts.....	.50
SHELDON—The Root of All Kinds of Evil. By Rev. Stewart Sheldon..	.10
SIMONS—The Economic Foundation of Art. By A. M. Simons.....	.05
SIMONS—Class Struggles in America. By A. M. Simons.....	.10
SOCIALIST CAMPAIGN BOOK. Edited Under the Supervision of the National Campaign Committee of the Party.....	.25
VAIL—The Socialist Movement. By Charles H. Vall.....	.10
WATERS—Career and Conversation of John Swinton. By Robert Waters .....	.25
WOOLDRIDGE—The Kingdom of Heaven Is at Hand. By C. W. Woold- ridge, M. D.....	.10

## MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS IN PAPER COVERS.

BISHOP—The Garden of Eden, U. S. A. By W. H. Bishop.....	\$ .50
DARROW—In Memory of John P. Altgeld. By Clarence S. Darrow....	.05
DARROW—The Rights and Wrongs of Ireland. By Clarence S. Darrow..	.10
FRANK—The Evolution of the Devil. By Henry Frank.....	.25
GOODE—The Modern Banker. By James Bryan Goode.....	.25
HILL—Money Found. By Thomas E. Hill.....	.25
MATTHEW—The Gospel of Matthew in Greek, with Vocabulary.....	.50
MILLER—Uncle Ike's Ideas. By George McA. Miller.....	.25
NORTON—Cast Thou the First Stone. By Frances Marie Norton.....	.50
PARKYN—Hypnotism as a Remedy for Mental Troubles. By Herbert A. Parkyn, M. D.....	.10
PARSONS—The Drift of Our Time. By Frank Parsons.....	.10
RICHARDS—Ahead of the Hounds. By Lydia Platt Richards.....	.50
WELCOME—From Earth's Center: A Single Tax Novel. By S. Byron Welcome .....	.25
WILSHIRE—Liquid Air. By H. Gaylord Wilshire.....	.10

### POCKET LIBRARY OF SOCIALISM.

1. Woman and the Social Problem. By May Wood Simons.
  2. The Evolution of the Class Struggle. By Wm. H. Noyes.
  3. Imprudent Marriages. By Robert Blatchford.
  4. Packingtown. By A. M. Simons.
  5. Realism in Literature and Art. By Clarence S. Darrow.
  6. Single Tax vs. Socialism. By A. M. Simons.
  7. Wage-Labor and Capital. By Karl Marx.
  8. The Man Under the Machine. By A. M. Simons.
  9. The Mission of the Working Class. By Rev. Charles H. Vail.
  10. Morals and Socialism. By Charles H. Kerr.
  11. Socialist Songs. By William Morris and Others.
  12. After Capitalism, What? By Rev. William T. Brown.
  13. Rational Prohibition. By Walter L. Young.
  14. Socialism and Farmers. By A. M. Simons.
  15. How I Acquired My Millions. By W. A. Corey.
  16. Socialists in French Municipalities. A compilation from official reports.
  17. Socialism and Trade Unionism. By Daniel Lynch and Max S. Hayes.
  18. Plutocracy or Nationalism, Which? By Edward Bellamy.
  19. The Real Religion of To-day. By Rev. William T. Brown.
  20. Why I Am a Socialist. By Prof. George D. Herron.
  21. The Trust Question. By Rev. Charles H. Vail.
  22. How to Work for Socialism. By Walter Thomas Mills.
  23. The Axe at the Root. By Rev. William T. Brown.
  24. What the Socialists Would Do if They Won in This City. By A. M. Simons.
  25. The Folly of Being "Good." By Charles H. Kerr.
  26. Intemperance and Poverty. By T. Twining.
  27. The Relation of Religion to Social Ethics. By Rev. William T. Brown.
  28. Socialism and the Home. By May Walden Kerr.
  29. Trusts and Imperialism. By H. Gaylord Wilshire.
  30. A Sketch of Social Evolution. By H. W. Boyd Mackay.
  31. Socialism vs. Anarchy. By A. M. Simons.
  32. Industrial Democracy. By J. W. Kelley.
  33. The Socialist Party—Platform, Constitution, etc.
  34. The Pride of Intellect. By Franklin H. Wentworth.
  35. The Philosophy of Socialism. By A. M. Simons.
  36. An Appeal to the Young. By Peter Kropotkin; translated by H. M. Hyndman.
  37. The Kingdom of God and Socialism. By Rev. Robert M. Webster.
  38. Easy Lessons in Socialism. By William H. Leffingwell.
- Price 5 cents a copy, 6 for 25 cents, 14 for 50 cents, 30 for \$1, \$2.25 a hundred, postpaid. To stockholders, 2 cents a copy, \$1 a hundred, postpaid.

### MADDEN LIBRARY.

1. What Is a Scab? By A. M. Simons.
  2. The Class Struggle. By A. M. Simons.
  3. Open Letter from a Catholic to Pope Leo XIII. By W. I. Brown.
  4. Why a "Workingman" Should Be a Socialist. By H. Gaylord Wilshire.
  5. Let's All Get Rich. By J. T. McDill.
  6. By the Throat: The Trusts Have Seized the Farmer. By Wm. R. Fox.
- Price 2 cents a copy, 15 cents a dozen, \$1.00 a hundred, postpaid. To stockholders 1 cent a copy, 50 cents a hundred, postpaid; \$4.00 a thousand by express at purchaser's expense.